India

FOR THE

No. 21. New Series.
No. 115. Old Series.

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, MAY 27, 1898.

Registered as a Newspaper.

Price...... 2d.
By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 321
Mr. Gladstone 324
The Natu Case—and After 324
A Committee in Leading Strings ... 326
Anglo-Indian Contempt and Indian Disaffection 327
The Week in Parliament 328
Letters to the Editor: The Currency Committee; How to Civilise the Afridis... 329
Chronicle of the Week 330
The Case of Mr. Tilak: Petition to the Queen 331
The Committee on Currency 332
Mr. Gladstone and India: Speech by Mr. Romesh C. Dutt, C.I.E. ... 332
India in Parliament 333
Advertisements 335-336

NOTES AND NEWS.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON has apparently decided upon a somewhat unusual course this year with regard to what is commonly, though inaccurately, called the debate on the Indian Budget. It appears from the too brief discussion which took place in the House of Commons last Tuesday that he will make the annual financial statement on June 7, when he moves the resolution required for the new East India Loan Bill. It is of course an obvious advantage that the debate on the financial statement should take place in the middle of the Session instead of at the end, when only a handful of members remain at Westminster. But this gain is hardly likely to be great on the day following the re-assembling of Parliament after the Whitsuntide recess, as the faithful Commons have a way of prolonging their holidays, and there is not likely to be much of a House on Tuesday, June 7. What is of greater importance is that the general discussion which usually takes place on the motion to go into Committee should not be curtailed. As to this, Sir Michael Hicks Beach hardly seems to have grasped the point of Sir William Wedderburn's enquiry. The resolution for the Loan Bill, being a financial resolution, will have to be moved in Committee, and it is in Committee that Lord G. Hamilton will make his financial statement. But, as we have pointed out again and again, there is practically no opportunity of moving amendments to the purely technical motion which is submitted upon the financial statement in Committee. That opportunity arises on the motion to go into Committee—or, as it is called, "to get the Speaker out of the chair." Unless, therefore, either (1) there is to be a general Indian debate on the motion to go into Committee on June 7, or (2) some later opportunity is provided, India's one field-day in the Session will be lost.

Of these alternatives (1) hardly seems to be contemplated, for if such a discussion took place there would certainly not be time left to move the resolution for the Loan Bill and make the financial statement on the same day. Sir Michael Hicks Beach's words ("and later on he will have an opportunity upon the Indian Budget") seems to point to (2). But it is not quite easy to see how, when once the financial statement has been made *in* Committee, there can be a subsequent discussion on a motion to go *into* Committee on the East India Revenue Accounts. And what is Lord G. Hamilton's object in combining the financial statement with the Loan Bill resolution, if it is not to save time by killing two birds with one stone? The intentions of the Government are far from clear. But at present it looks as if the Indian Parliamentary Committee would do well to assume that their chief opportunity must arise on June 7, and give notice accordingly of their several amendments.

We must reserve for fuller notice next week the important Blue-book upon the new law of sedition in India, which has been issued at last, on the adjournment of the House of Commons for the Whitsuntide recess. It is greatly to be regretted that the compilation does not include the report of the proceedings in the Viceroy's Council upon the various stages of the two measures. The *Gazette of India*, which contains these proceedings, is no doubt accessible to members of Parliament in the library of the House of Commons, but it is not on sale in this country, and is not likely to be in the hands of many persons whose duty it is to look closely into the whole matter. The Blue-book shows, among other things, that the Secretary of State is largely responsible both for the provisions of the new law and for the unseemly and inexcusable haste with which it has been enacted. The correspondence between the Government of India and the India Office throws much valuable light upon the origin of the measures and their relation to Mr. Justice Strachey's amazing summing-up in the Tilak case. It also shows that on April 21 Lord G. Hamilton informed the Government of India that the Act to amend the Indian Penal Code would be "left to its operation," and on May 17 a like decision was announced with reference to the new Code of Criminal Procedure.

We fail to see how this action is to be made to square with Lord G. Hamilton's declaration in the House of Commons on February 18, that when the "opinions" expressed in the Legislative Council came home, "if it was desired that they should be published, he would at once do so, and that would form a legitimate and proper opportunity for discussing the matter." When and how is such an opportunity to be provided now? It might perhaps have been provided by a motion for the adjournment of the House. But that course is no longer open at present, for Mr. Parker Smith, as will be seen from our Parliamentary report, has thoughtfully given notice of a "blocking" motion. Mr. Parker Smith has not hitherto, to the best of our recollection, betrayed much interest in Indian affairs; and yet his brother is, we believe, private secretary to the Viceroy of India. But that of course is a mere coincidence.

On another page will be found the text of a petition which has recently been submitted to her Majesty the Queen praying for the release of Mr. Tilak. The petition, we understand, owes its origin to Professor Max Müller. It is strictly non-political. The signatories do not belong to any particular section or party.

The following telegram was sent on May 20 to the Right Hon. Herbert J. Gladstone by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji on behalf of the London Indian Society:—

> London Indian Society express their deep sorrow at Mr. Gladstone's death and offer their sincere sympathy to Mrs. Gladstone and family. —Dadabhai Naoroji (*President*).

Elsewhere will be found a report of a speech in which Mr. Romesh Dutt describes Mr. Gladstone's services to India.

A Calcutta telegram of Saturday last reported that "after numerous instances of murderous assaults on supposed inoculators for the plague, and attacks on ambulances removing suspected cases," a serious riot had that day broken out at Bhowanipur in the suburbs of Calcutta. "A doctor who was engaged in selecting an isolation site was mobbed and pursued until he had taken refuge in a house. Eventually, after giving fair warning, he fired, killing one person and wounding two." Three thousand persons are said to have taken part in the riot, which lasted two hours, and the mob "finally dispersed on the arrival of a force of armed police." Side by side with this lamentable story, let us reproduce a passage from the *Pioneer Mail* of May 6, which reached us last Monday:

> Unfortunately, after successfully allaying the dread of segregation, the plague authorities in Calcutta have now to combat a new panic. A belief is gaining ground among the ignorant masses that inoculation is to be compulsory in spite of Sir John Woodburn's strong assurance to the contrary; and as there exists a further belief that inoculation is a necessarily fatal operation, the terror thus inspired is bringing about a renewed exodus.

It is too early to pronounce any opinion upon Sir John Woodburn's measures to combat the plague in Calcutta.

But he seems to have taken up inoculation with the greatest ardour. He is reported to have said in the Legislative Council on April 30 (we quote from the report in the *Pioneer*):—

The new method of inoculation will, I repeat, be pressed on nobody; but this method, when once you have assured yourself of its efficacy, has, I am satisfied, an assurance of safety to our city. I have decided to make a great experiment. We have intimated to you that where families have been completely inoculated we will leave them alone, even if the plague attacks a member of it. It is a risk, but a risk worth running. We accept it because we believe that the inoculated patient will at the worst have the very mildest form of attack, and he will not be a material danger to his family or his neighbours. The policy of segregation is a policy of painful necessity. The policy of inoculation we suggest to you is at last—and for the first time in the great battle with the plague in India—a policy of hope.

Which is another way of saying that, if a person declines inoculation, he runs the risk of segregation. But it is fair to add that segregation at Calcutta is a very different thing from segregation at Poona or Bombay. We quote again from Sir John Woodburn's speech to the members of the Bengal Legislative Council:—

In another and very important matter I will ask you to give your aid in assuring the people that whenever segregation is necessary it will be carried out with the strictest regard to the feelings of human nature. No wife shall be separated from her husband, no husband from his family; and the better classes will receive every encouragement in the arrangement of private hospitals in their own compounds or garden-houses in the suburbs to which they can remove themselves and their families.

On account of the dislike evinced by Indians to quarantine and segregation camps, it is of the first importance that all such measures should be carried out with the utmost impartiality. The following story speaks for itself. It is told by a correspondent of the *Champion* who was proceeding from Bombay to Nagpur, armed with a pass exempting him as a merchant from quarantine:—

The train reached a railway station on the G. I. P. Railway at about 7.30 a.m. Here I was told by the medical officer in charge of the quarantine camp to alight and go to the quarantine camp without any examination. With great confidence and hope I showed him the certificate. But alas, the certificate that had magic power so long, here lost it. The officer bluntly said "That won't do here," and without further ado ordered the police officers under him to take me to the quarantine camp. Then turning to the three European passengers that were in the same second class compartment with me, he said with a patronising air: "Well, gentlemen, I don't think you have brought any plague germs with you." "Not at all," said one of them, "not even our two servants who are in the lot taken out to be detained in the quarantine camp." "Oh," said the officer, "are there your servants in the lot?" "Yes, the first two," said one of them who was silent up to this time, pointing them out with his fore-finger. "*Wo do admiko jane deo,*" cried out the medical officer, and the two servants of the sahebs were let off by the police constable in whose charge they were given! All the while the detained passengers, who were more than twenty in number, and some of whom were English-knowing Native gentlemen, were silently but attentively listening to what was passing before their own eyes. We were all marched off to the quarantine camp, after the train steamed off.

Of course we must not be regarded as vouching for the accuracy of this account. It is, indeed, greatly to be wished that such stories were always accompanied by precise details as to date and place. It is the absence of exact information of this kind which frequently baffles those who in this country are willing and eager to do their best to procure attention for Indian grievances.

We have received an elaborate "Report on Bubonic Plague," by Khan Bahadur N. H. Choksy, extra assistant Health Officer to the Bombay Municipality (Bombay: printed at the *Times of India* Steam Press). It is based upon observations on 939 cases treated at the Municipal Hospital for Infectious Diseases at Arthur Road, Bombay, from September 24, 1896, to February 28, 1897. The strain is indicated by the extreme difficulty in procuring additional servants, even when double and treble the usual pay was offered, and by the fact that, even when men were induced to join, they not unfrequently ran away after a few hours or days, not returning even to claim their wages. "Old servants could with difficulty be induced to remain, and a majority of them," appalled by the condition of the victims, "went on strike and refused to work." The mortality at the hospital, and certain of the surgical and medical operations, aroused hostility through the ignorance and prejudices of the people. It was freely stated that the patients were purposely killed and their hearts taken out in order to send them to her Majesty the Queen-Empress to appease her wrath on account of the disfigurement of her statute, which occurred in the beginning of the epidemic"; and this hostility culminated in the raid of October 29, 1896, on the hospital, by some 800 to 1,000 mill-hands. The demoralisation occasioned by the plague appears to have been frightful.

A large number [of the visitors] tarried for a short time, not out of any consideration for the patients, but with the sole object of eliciting information from the sick as regards their belongings, property, etc., whilst in other cases they simply came to relieve the patients of all the valuables on their persons, and never appeared again to enquire after them or to give them a decent burial when they died. All family ties and ties of kinship appeared to have been forgotten for the time being, and husbands deserted their wives and *vice versa*, and even children were deserted by their parents.

The statistics are sufficiently formidable. Of the total admissions 32·58 were in a moribund condition and died within 24 hours. The general mortality rate was 73·26 per cent; or, excluding the moribund, 60·34 per cent. The effects of insufficient nutrition were markedly disastrous. The clinical notes, which are as full as was reasonably possible under the severe strain, are appalling. But they constitute a most useful record. Dr. Choksy does not rate the curative treatment highly: "all the means at our command can do," he says, "is simply to tide the patients over the most critical period and to assist nature in recovering her original sway over the system. In fact, the patients that left the hospital alive might more fitly be described as recovered than cured." An essentially milk diet was found to answer best. Sero-therapy was tried on a very limited scale, and the different preparations of serum showed very different results—if indeed it can be said that any conclusion is to be legitimately drawn from so narrow a field of experiment. Professor Lustig's serum was applied in six very serious cases, every one of which recovered. In all the applications of serum, the regular treatment went on independently; the sero-therapy being purely supplemental. Appended to the volume are thirty-six elaborate charts showing the variations of temperature in the different forms of the disease. Dr. Choksy appears to have done yeoman's service at a critical time. If the title of Khan Bahadur—a sufficiently odd title for a Parsee, and for a doctor—is the Government's recognition of his work, we must say that it is a mark of unwonted parsimony.

The zemindars of Mozuffernagar have submitted a sensible memorial to the Famine Commission upon the importance of sinking irrigation wells. The subject demands careful consideration. In some respects wells have been found to be even more efficacious than canals. Canal water sometimes fails in years of drought. Wells seldom fail. And canals tend to make neighbouring villages damp and malarious, while wells improve the health of villages by affording a constant source of good water. The memorialists say:—

It is of great importance that wells should be sunk, repaired, and kept in use on as large a scale as possible, and this has the first claim upon the Famine Insurance Fund. The people themselves, both Hindus and Mahometans, consider the sinking of wells a charity of the best kind, and their religious precepts ordain them very strictly on the point. Accordingly they are always bent upon sinking wells for drinking as well as for irrigation purposes, but there are some difficulties and drawbacks in their way, as of getting good sinkers, instruments, etc. If the Government be pleased to help them in this respect, the Association has no doubt that more wells can be sunk by the people themselves every year. It may also be added here that, in a pecuniary point of view, these wells will not only be beneficial to tenants at the famine time, but will cause great improvement in rental and revenue to the benefit of both the landholders and Government all the years round of plenty and scarcity.

The anxiety of certain persons to discover chances of misrepresenting the Indian National Congress would be rather amusing if it were not so thoroughly contemptible. The *Times* printed last Monday a long telegram from its Simla correspondent upon a letter addressed to the Bengal Government by the British Indian Association of Calcutta, "representing the landed interest." The letter, which seems to have spoken of "the alleged rights of the rayats," amounted apparently to a request that the present rules regarding the election of members of legislative councils in India should be so modified as to secure more adequate representation of the landed interest. "It is contrary to all principle," we are told, "that a tax paid by one class should be administered by another"—and so forth, in a style worthy of our own House of Lords. All this is melancholy enough. But the Simla correspondent of the

Times went out of his way to describe the letter as "showing the bitterest hostility against the Congress party" and "the demagogues of the Indian National Congress." Yet in the letter of the British Indian Association there does not appear to be a single reference to the Congress. The mischievous purpose of the telegram was transparently clear, as the members of the British Indian Association will doubtless perceive if they read it.

The absence of the Indian Provincial Governments from their capitals during the hot season is a common subject of complaint, especially if any really important business has to be transacted. The announcement that the Madras Tenancy Bill will be brought forward at Ootacamund in the Nilgiris has evoked a united protest from the Anglo-Indian and Indian Press alike. It is not only that the Bill has been but a short time before the public and is in no sense of extreme urgency; nor is it that of the nineteen members of the Council only seven are now at the Hills, while the remainder, if they wish to be present, must leave their business and undertake a long journey. There is a still stronger reason. The whole atmosphere of Ootacamund is purely official, and the members of the Council do not there feel the full force of public opinion, as it is felt in Madras. Nowhere is it so important that legislators should be in a position to gauge the public wishes as where elective institutions do not exist.

As will be seen from our Parliamentary report, Lord G. Hamilton stated on Monday, in reply to Sir W. Wedderburn, that although the Bill might be introduced at Ootacamund, he had "no reason to suppose" that it would be discussed in Council elsewhere than in Madras. If it should be the case that the Government has no desire to stifle discussion, and that the Bill will merely be placed in the hands of a Select Committee at Ootacamund, so much the better. But of course it should not even in its first stage be dealt with at a place where popular opinion cannot make itself heard.

The truth is that there is something radically wrong with the method of legislation in India. Bills being drafted by Government officials, often without the knowledge of the people, the sanction of the Secretary of State is privately obtained, and a cut-and-dried scheme is introduced in what are facetiously called "Legislative Councils," to the astonishment of those for whose good the measures are supposed to be intended. Then of course the principles approved by the Secretary of State cannot be departed from, some slight modification in details are alone permitted, and the Bills are passed. Such would seem to have been the history of the new Sedition Acts, of the Post Office Act, and of the New Calcutta Municipal Bill. Clearly, the Councils are a farce and a deception if they are merely to adopt, practically unaltered, the "mandates" of the Secretary of State, and the election to the councils is a mischievous illusion if elected members have no power to veto a Bill, or to change it principles.

One is glad to learn that the Madras Mahajana Sabha (People's Association) has started preparations for the fourteenth session of the Indian National Congress, which will be held in Madras next December. A strong and representative working committee has been appointed, consisting of most of the men who made the session of 1893 a conspicuous success. We understand that the Committee has addressed circulars to other parts of the Presidency, and will shortly adopt a plan of campaign to bring all the towns within the scope of the organisation.

It seems that there was a Hindu festival at Ooty on the night of April 12, and on account of the car processions a lady had to take a somewhat circuitous route home. Incidents like this frequently happen in European towns on festive occasions, and no reasonable man resents such processions, which delight the people. But our Anglo-Indian friends sometimes have short tempers, and the *Nilgiri News* remarks: "It is about time that the bazar community were distinctly given to understand that they exist for Ooty, and not Ooty for the Bazar." Is it not the spirit that is here exhibited which is at the root of a good deal of the mischief in India?

The Hon. C. C. Stevens acted as Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal for six months during last year, and proved one of the most sympathetic and wise rulers of the country. On his retirement from India, after a service of over thirty-five years, a well-deserved tribute of praise has been accorded to him in the official *Gazette*. This seems to have been too much for some of the Anglo-Indian journals. The *Indian Daily News* of Calcutta remarks that "the eulogies that Lieutenant-Governors and Viceroys bestow in the pages of the *Gazette* on public servants are generally ridiculous for their extraordinary mendacity." And the same journal asks, "why publish these exaggerated falsehoods in the *Gazette*"? If the new Sedition Law has been passed for impartial administration among all classes of journals in India, is not this a case for prosecution for bringing the Government into "contempt"?

We congratulate Mr. P. C. Chatterji on his confirmation as Judge of the Chief Court of the Punjab, and Mr. B. L. Gupta on his appointment to act as Judge of the Calcutta High Court. Mr. Gupta belonged to the first set of Indians appointed to the Bengal Civil Service in 1871, and there was not, we believe, an abler District Judge in Bengal. He is now the senior Indian member of the Civil Service of India, Mr. Tagore of Bombay and Mr. Dutt of Bengal having retired.

An Anglo-Indian correspondent writes: "The short table below gives the totals of the seaborne trade of British India for the nine months ending with last December, and for the corresponding period in the two previous years:—

April to December, in Rupees.

EXPORTS.	1897.	1896.	1895.
Merchandise ..	68,62,11,969	75,14,99,040	80,65,47,127
Treasure	5,61,44,681	3,75,70,272	3,60,14,695
Total Exports	74.23,56,650	78,90,69,312	84,25,61,822
IMPORTS.			
Merchandise ..	52,83,13,025	58,52,09,922	53,12,91,326
Treasure	14,54,87,532	8,74,30,866	9,37,97,051
Total Imports	67,38,00,557	67,26,40,788	62,50,88,377
India's Commercial Deficit in	Rx. 6,85,56,093	11,642,852	21,747,344

These figures as they stand show an aggregate excess of India's trade outgoings over her incomings of 40¼ millions Rx. on the three periods of our table; and if, by way of illustration for the moment, we add one-third to make up as for the whole three years, that indicates an annual average of about 18 millions Rx., this being India's trade deficit in the three periods. But when the whole figures come forward for the full year ending with March, the deficiency will show much more than this; for, as a matter of fact, the excess of India's exports for the two years, 1894-6, alone amounted to 66½ millions!

"Various guesses and certain explanations suggest themselves as to the differences in the totals of the above cited three periods; but there is only one that needs to be noted here—chiefly as relating to the smaller deficit in 1897 as compared with the other two. The explanation is (*a*) general, and (*b*) applying specially to 1897. (*a*) To India's trade deficit in any year must be added the sum of sterling debt taken up here; also the rupee paper (India's Consols) remitted to have the interest paid here—less the sum of such rupee paper returned to India. Therefore, (*b*) to the nearly seven millions of India's trade deficit in those nine months in 1897, must be added the sterling debt incurred here, about six millions, also the suspended amount of the Secretary of State's drawings, nearly five millions more—yet to be drawn out of India somehow. Thus the real deficit in that 1897 period becomes over eighteen million Rx., making up the average for these periods as shown above.

"Here, then, we have the one dominant factor behind and beneath all the deluge of debate as to Indian standards, currency, exchange, and finance. All that the commissions and committees may do to salve over the surface, and hide away that, as yet, inexorable factor, can be nothing better than the ''parmaceti for an inward bruise.' The only true remedial method effectually to alleviate—it will not cure—India's hæmorrhage, is for the British Treasury to sustain at least half the Home charges; and to this complexion must we come at last."

MR. GLADSTONE.

WHEN the news of Mr. Gladstone's death, for which all England had been sorrowfully waiting, came on Thursday morning (May 19) many mourners found expression for their feelings in the lines which Mr. Gladstone had himself used many years ago of Sir Robert Peel:—

> Now is the stately column broke,
> The beacon light is quenched in smoke,
> The trumpet's silver voice is still,
> The warder silent on the hill.

That first feeling of simple sorrow for the inevitable end and loss has already been succeeded by another mood, which also has its fullest expression in poetry. Men are living for the moment in one of those pauses of silence that fall upon the noisy strife of the world and seem to mark the passing from one generation to another:

> And o'er the plain where the dead age
> Did its now silent warfare wage—
> O'er that wide plain, now wrapt in gloom,
> Where many a splendour finds its tomb,
> Many spent fames and fallen mights—
> The one or two immortal lights
> Rise slowly up into the sky
> To shine there everlastingly,
> Like stars over the bounding hill.

So the sense of loss is already softened by the consciousness that a new planet has swum into our ken. His greatness abides, and we know it better than we knew it when he was near us. Shelley's lament for Adonais bursts at last into a strain of triumph: "He is made one with Nature." England's lament—may we not say, on the strength of many testimonies, the world's lament?—for her greatest citizen ends triumphantly too. "He is made one with Nature": his life is a part of the history of the race, a cherished memory and an inspiring example for all time to come.

When we ask what made Mr. Gladstone so great, the answer, to a certain extent, is easy enough. Men of all parties agree in finding his greatness in a marvellous combination of intellectual faculties, inspired and directed by the loftiest moral purpose. There was, first, his oratorical power, falling in its highest and most sustained flights a little below the eloquence of Mr. Bright, but of greater range than the oratory of Mr. Bright or of any contemporary—an instrument equally effective for all the varied purposes of debate, argument, and exposition in the House of Commons, and for the passionate and persuasive rhetoric or vehement invective that carries with it the feelings of a crowd. Future generations will find it difficult to realise the power of that oratory as they study it in the written records. "The words indeed are there," said Mr. Balfour in the finest passage of one of the noblest and most generous tributes ever paid to one statesman by another, "lying side by side with the words of lesser men in an equality as if of death. But the spirit, the fire, the inspiration are gone, and he who could alone revive them, he who could alone shew us what these words really were, by reproducing them for us, he, alas! has now been taken away." The long involved sentences, dignified and even majestic, but bristling with circumlocutions and qualifications, are full of interest for the light they throw upon the subtle intellect of the speaker, but can never be praised as the perfection of English prose. They owed their wonderful efficacy to "the golden mouth and smiting eyes." Behind this oratorical power, and supplying it with unfailing material, was the most comprehensive brain in the three kingdoms. Those who met him in private, and heard the fulness of information that he poured out upon any subject that came up into casual conversation, were continually amazed at the depth and variety of his knowledge. His versatility was simply bewildering. "Gladstone's wits," said one who distrusted him, "are like an army without a controlling general." How few men there are whose brains suggest anything so massive as an army, general or no general! This power of acquiring and retaining knowledge on all conceivable subjects—which, by the way, made him more learned in any one of half-a-dozen "hobbies" than many men who have given their whole lives to a particular study—was of the greatest service to him in politics. To take one application of it only, it made him a greater master of finance than any English statesman had been before him. The sound financial position which England occupies to-day to the envy of all other nations is due to his work mainly.

"The corruption of the best is worst," and this magnificent intellectual endowment might only have brought Mr. Gladstone and his country to disaster if there had been no higher controlling influence. But the truth is that the army had its general: the intellectual faculties were disciplined by moral purpose. Mr. Gladstone's religion was no secret, but probably few guessed, until the revelations made just before or since his death, the intensity of it or the time which he spared for it out of his busiest days. Wordsworth describes the ideal warrior and statesman as one

> Who in the heat of conflict keeps the law
> In calmness made, and sees what he foresaw.

It is now plain that it was in the "calmness" of communion with the unseen that Mr. Gladstone gathered the strength and purity that kept his soul unsullied in the "heat of conflict." Here, too, was the secret of at least part of the marvellous courage that was one of his most notable characteristics. Once he was convinced of its justice, no step was too bold for him to take. The fear of being taunted with inconsistency (someone has profoundly called consistency "the slow poison of intellectual life," and it may be the poison of moral life as well) never stopped him; nor the fear of unpopularity; nor that greatest terror of all to a statesman, the fear of destroying his own party. When the first rumour, as yet unconfirmed, spread of his intention to bring forward Home Rule, one of the shrewdest and most experienced of Radicals, the late Henry Dunckley, wrote that the one thing certain was that the party which adopted the programme would be "shattered to atoms" at the next general election. It was in face of this prospect that Mr. Gladstone committed himself to what he had only just convinced himself to be the right course, and set himself single-handed at the age of seventy-six to reverse the judgment of the English nation.

Without his intellectual qualities he could neither have gained nor kept his commanding position; but it was his moral qualities that gave him power to sway the heart of the people as no other statesman has ever done. His courage attracted, for "this nation," as Lord Rosebery said on Friday, "loves brave men." So did the depth of his convictions. He always appealed to high motives, the love of justice and of truth, generosity, sympathy with the oppressed. And the appeal went home, because it never rang hollow, but was manifestly the utterance of the speaker's inmost nature. The same qualities account for the attraction he had for men of the like depth of character and for the intense feeling of repulsion he roused in some of his enemies. "I love Mr. Gladstone," wrote the late Lord Tennyson, even when he was constrained to add, "I hate his policy." On the other hand, politicians who were governed by frankly material considerations, whether of their own, or their party's, or their country's interests, instinctively disliked a man whose motives were unintelligible to them.

So much seems to emerge clearly as we take a rapid retrospective view of sixty years of laborious service to the State. Of the positive value of his statesmanship in many of its aspects it may yet be premature to speak. One thing, however, the last few days have done. The spontaneous outbursts of reverent affection from all parts of the world have given the lie to the maxim that generosity in international politics is always interpreted as weakness. Not to such statesmanship as Mr. Gladstone's, with his sympathy for the oppressed all over the world, does England owe the taunt that she is "a nation of shopkeepers."

THE NATU CASE—AND AFTER.

ON Tuesday last, as will be seen from our Parliamentary report, Sir William Wedderburn presented to Parliament the petition from the wife of Sirdar B. R. Natu, the full text of which we printed in our issue of May 13. It will be remembered that after the receipt of the petition in London, but before the arrival of all the documents which it was thought essential to publish here in view of the proposed debate on the whole case, an announcement was made that the Natu brothers had been released. As the announcement was immediately confirmed by independent and authoritative testimony, it naturally appeared that the presentation of the petition was no longer necessary. But the statement made by Lord George

Hamilton in the House of Commons, in reply to a question from Mr. Swift MacNeill, put a somewhat different complexion upon the matter. "I understand," Lord G. Hamilton said, "that the Natu brothers have not been released by the Government of Bombay, but have been allowed to live in private houses in Belgaum, where they own property, and where their families can join them. Subject to their good conduct, all restrictions will be relaxed except that, pending further orders, they will not be allowed to leave Belgaum." That is to say, the Natu brothers, according to Lord G. Hamilton's information, are still technically State prisoners. The Bombay Government retains its hold upon them, as upon a captive balloon. In these circumstances the petition, which prayed for their complete and unconditional release, ceased to be superfluous, and Sir W. Wedderburn's decision to present it will be generally approved. The original plan of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, by which the petition would have been publicly presented and discussed under the provisions of Standing Order No. 80 (cited in INDIA, p. 276), ceased indeed to be applicable. It could hardly be contended with success that the rather technical and theoretical restrictions which are now imposed upon Sirdar Natu and his brother constitute a "present personal grievance" for which there is "an urgent necessity for providing an immediate remedy." But it was nevertheless desirable that the purpose of the petition, and the nature of the grievance which remains to be removed should be clearly explained to the House of Commons, and this is the office which Sir William Wedderburn has discharged. The reception of his remarks by the House was highly significant in more than one way. At the mention of the Natus a spontaneous cheer rose from the benches of the Opposition, and Sir William Wedderburn had the cordial support of the Liberal members throughout his brief speech. Very different was the attitude of the Ministerialists opposite. Like the good constitutionalists they are, they were shocked at the thought that British Indian subjects of the Crown should petition the House of Commons. The right of petition from India, it would seem, has in their judgment been relegated to limbo along with free speech and the other trifles summarily disposed of by the new law of sedition. Accordingly our latter-day constitutionalists kept up a loud cry of "Order, order." The recital of the prayer of the petition was more than their susceptible consciences could endure. But it is satisfactory to see, as the scene in the House on Tuesday shows, that efforts both to complete the release of the Natus and to prevent any repetition of the outrageous misuse of authority to which they owed their imprisonment will have the whole-hearted support of the Liberal party in this country.

In a Bombay telegram published in our issue of May 13 it was announced that the publication in the *Champion* of correspondence relative to the detention of the Natus had excited a profound sensation throughout India. It was suggested indeed that their partial release was not wholly unconnected with the disclosures so made. The Natus, as we gather from the *Champion's* compilation, deny expressly every allegation that Lord George Hamilton has advanced against them. They know nothing of the ridiculous letter "purporting" to be signed by them. They repudiate the allegation of attempted corruption. They have been in no way connected with any general conspiracy—by the way, what has become of that serious and widely extended conspiracy, radiating from Poona all over the Deccan?—nor yet with the foul murder of Mr. Rand and Lieutenant Ayerst. The allegation with respect to the midwife who lost her practice has a flood of fresh light poured upon it by the correspondence published in the *Champion*. In every particular the Government has failed, as it was bound to fail, to support the mutually destructive grounds it has advanced, and we can only reiterate our belief that the whole outrageous scandal is the outcome of ignorance and panic.

Reparation to the Natus is clearly necessary, and it is plain that this arbitrary trick of deportation must not be repeated. Those who are interested in the matter will look for the statutory authority upon which the Government claimed to be acting. Mr. E. H. Pickersgill, M.P., dealt with this point in our issue of April 22. Regulation III of 1818 may be left aside. Mr. Justice Norman, in the proceeding entitled *In the matter of Amir Khan* (1870, Bengal Law Reports, vi 392) said "it appears to have been passed under 37 Geo. III, c. 142, sect. 8." With all submission we suggest that that view must be mistaken section 8 providing, not for the enactment, but for the printing, "with translations in the country languages," of such regulations as were already made, or should thereafter be made. This, however, only in passing, and as an illustration of the necessity of cautious examination. The Bombay Government acted expressly on Regulation XXV of 1827. Mr. Pickersgill, in the article referred to, set out the essential terms of the Regulation, but it may be well to have them immediately before us. The title is "A Regulation for the confinement of State prisoners, and for the attachment of the lands of chieftains and others for reasons of State." The terms of the title are almost as wide as it is possible to make them. If they cover the brothers Natu, it is because they cover everybody. Let us pass to the preamble :—

Whereas reasons of State, embracing the due maintenance of the alliances formed by the British Government with foreign Powers, the preservation of tranquillity in the territories of Native Princes entitled to its protection, and the security of the British dominions from foreign hostility and from internal commotion, occasionally render it necessary to place under personal restraint individuals against whom there may not be sufficient ground to institute any judicial proceedings, or when such proceedings may not be adapted to the nature of the case, or may for other reasons be unadvisable or improper; and whereas it is fit that in every case of the nature herein referred to the measure adopted should emanate immediately from the Governor in Council.

Here, again, if we take the enacting clauses with this preamble, it seems that anybody is liable at any moment, even in a period "of profound peace," to be subjected to "personal restraint" on the mere fiat of the Governor in Council, acting on what he considers "good and sufficient reasons." "For good and sufficient reasons" is the expression of the formal warrant of commitment (INDIA, April 22, p. 247). Here is *carte blanche* to the Governor in Council to lock up, for "reasons of State," any "individuals" whatsoever. No positive grounds of offence are indicated which could, apparently, in the least apply to the case of the brothers Natu. Nobody (outside official circles in panic) would for a moment concede that the state of Poona at the end of July last year, when the Natus were arrested, could rationally come under the terms of the preamble. It was not a state of "internal commotion" in any reasonable interpretation of the Regulation. But this is not all. The full expression is, not "internal commotion," but "the security of the British dominions from . . . . internal commotion." On July 30, 1897, the Bombay Government expressly ordered that Sirdar Natu might be informed "that the reason for his arrest is that Government thought it necessary to place him under personal restraint for the better security of a part of her Majesty's dominions from internal commotion." Can any man of judgment maintain that the continued freedom of the brothers Natu would have infringed, endangered, or in the smallest tittle affected "the security" of even a part "of the British dominions"? Could there be a more palpable demonstration of the needlessness and injustice of their arrest and detention? In a time of panic especially, the safeguards of independent judgment of individual members—such as they are—are apt to give way; and "the Governor in Council" becomes a mere title for a handful of men ignorant of the true causes of an ugly situation, and desperately apprehensive of the possibilities.

Mr. Pickersgill stated his opinion that, judging from the terms of the preamble of Regulation XXV of 1827, "if it was made under any Imperial authority at all, that authority was sec. 36 of 13 Geo. 3, c. 36." This statute is known as the Regulating Act. It is dated 1773. It empowered the supreme Government in India "from time to time to make and issue such rules, ordinances, and regulations for the good order and civil government of the United Company's settlement at Fort William, and other factories and places subordinate thereto, as shall be deemed just and reasonable (such rules, ordinances, and regulations not being repugnant to the laws of the nation), and to impose reasonable fines and forfeiture for the breach and non-observance thereof." The main portion of the Regulation Law, however, was passed under the Act of 1781 (21 Geo. 3, c. 70), enabling the Governor-General in Council to legislate without reference to the Supreme Court, which supervised and had power to veto their enactments under the Act of 1773. Now, whatever may have been done under the latter Act, it is certain that under the former the authorities legislated as they liked,

regardless of any statutory limits of their power; but the Act of 1797 healed all defects. In 1807 the Calcutta powers of legislation were vested in the Bombay Governor in Council, after the terms of the Regulating Act of 1773. It becomes, then, a question whether the Regulation of 1827 is within the power to make and issue "rules, ordinances, and regulations" for the "good order and civil government" of the Presidency; and if so, whether it is "just and reasonable," and "not repugnant to the laws of the nation."

An obvious reply is that it is too late to raise any such question. But in view of such a reply it may be pointed out that the Regulation could not survive if it could be shown, in a proper case, and in due form, to be "repugnant to the laws of the nation;" and in this connexion we would again refer to Mr. Pickersgill's article, and especially to his citation from Sir E. Ryan's Minute. The penalty for breach of the "rules, ordinances, and regulations"—namely, the imposition of reasonable fines and forfeiture—falls a long way short of deportation and detention, such as the Natus have been subjected to under Regulation XXV of 1827; and it appears to indicate a far less sweeping exercise of power than the terms of the Regulation set forth. Apart from the legal aspect of the question, and not less important intrinsically, is the practical question of the effect of such a statutory power upon the society it is invoked to control. Everybody feels that it is an anachronism. In the time of Warren Hastings there might have been something to say for it; though, apparently, even then such a power was never contemplated by the Act of 1773. If we look at the state of the country in 1827, we can see—and the very terms of the preamble help us to see—that the main intention of the Regulation regarded the unsettled condition of Native States more than anything else. The engagement of the British troops in the Burmese War had suggested opportunities to Native discontent, and the result is seen in the long series of interventions in Native States during the viceroyalty of Lord William Bentinck. Even if we grant both the legality and the necessity of such a Regulation in 1827, it must be regarded as a dead letter now. That it has been brought into operation in a time "of profound peace" indicates merely weakness in the Government. It is not the people, but the Government, and the Government alone, that is to blame. The whole course of events in connexion with the difficulties at Poona shows clearly that there is not the slightest trouble when the man in command on the spot is capable and intelligently sympathetic. But this Regulation must be set aside. It is purely irritating. It suggests a wholly false idea of weakness in the British power—a very different thing from weakness in the Bombay Government, though many people are but too likely to identify the one with the other. It is dangerous to the Government more than to the lieges. We trust, therefore, that some courageous member of Parliament will take up the question, and we hope that Commons and Lords will join in removing from the hands of the governing weaklings of Bombay a weapon which may not only wound an occasional Indian, but explode disastrously in the hands of "the Governor in Council."

A COMMITTEE IN LEADING STRINGS.

COMMENTING on Lord G. Hamilton's reply to the memorandum of bankers, merchants, and traders in the City of London upon the Currency Committee, and on Sir Robert Giffen's criticisms of the Government's project, the *Times* appears to throw to the winds the teachings of economic experience. "Let us start," it says, "with recognition of the fact that, if a gold standard is difficult, it only proves that India is between the devil and the deep sea. She has to be saved somehow." "The deep sea" is evidently intended to signify the menacing abyss of bankruptcy. "The devil"—we leave it to Lord G. Hamilton and to our readers to supply their own interpretation. We take it, however, that "the devil," whoever or whatever may be meant, is the agent or the agency which is driving India into "the deep sea." "She has to be saved somehow," no doubt. But, if it should turn out that her would-be saviours are to be identified with "the devil," her chances are not insurable at a moderate premium. The fact that India is in dire difficulties is not even matter of dispute. Sir Robert Giffen would not, as we understand him, question the fact for a moment. Nor does anyone doubt that India must be saved somehow. But it does not by any means follow, as the *Times* seems to argue, that the particular method of a gold standard will prove a remedy at all. And what can it matter whether a critic perceives or does not perceive "that the Indian Government did not begin to meddle with the currency in mere lightness of heart, but under strong compulsion to escape financial embarrassments of the gravest kind"? Everybody knows all that. For years we have been calling attention to the *impasse* into which the Government was steadily and surely drifting. We predicted the failure of the initial steps taken by it in closing the mints; and we have seen our prediction verified most dismally. The Government certainly was bound "to do something;" but it is not to escape criticism on the ground that it has acted seriously on lines that are obviously wrong. We shall be the first to praise it the moment it lays its axe to the root of the real upas tree.

The apparent success which the *Times* sees in the results of the Anglo-Indian financial policy of the past five years is wholly deceptive. As we have already pointed out, it is the easy success that comes of copious borrowing. The policy has been successful only in throwing heavier burdens on the taxpayer and the country generally; not in any sound sense whatever. There is but too ample ground in experience for objections to any further advance on the wrong road. The example of France is thoroughly deceptive, and the *Times* is blind to the fatal weakness of the parallel. How in the world can the French system be set up in Calcutta? Where is the enormous gold reserve—such as even the Bank of France keeps—to come from? The example of English cheques is equally deceptive. True, every cheque in the country could not be cashed at one and the same moment; but, we take it, few of us would accept cheques if we had not a well-grounded assurance that we could convert them into cash at any time we chose to present them. To argue from the point of "general conversion" is simply to miss the lesson. The question for each man is, not whether every cheque can be paid at the same time, but, "Shall I get gold for this particular cheque if I present it now?" "When there is a panic, what do we do?" asks the *Times*. "Get more gold? Not at all; we add to the note issue, and forthwith everybody is happy, though he knows that the notes are not immediately and readily convertible, and, indeed, for the time not convertible at all." Now this is theoretically true only under special and exceptional circumstances, and in actual practice it is hardly true at all. But, in any case, does the *Times* gravely recommend that we should try this sort of thing in India? One is appalled at the egregious confidence of the suggestion. Here is the "leading newspaper" actually arguing, in a question fraught with incalculable issues, on the implied assumption that English credit and Anglo-Indian credit are parallel entities, and that the English public mind is a safe parallel to the Anglo-Indian public mind in a time of financial panic. The good fortune of the matter is that no one who is likely to have a determining voice in the question will be so blind as not to see through the sophistry.

The City memorial to Lord George Hamilton is opportune, and in the severe restraint of its expression may be discerned a strength of conviction which the Government will do well to note and to respect. At the back of it all lies a powerful mass of facts to which we have pointed on previous occasions. The memorial complains of the composition of the Committee, and expresses the feeling of the City that it "should have been composed to a larger extent of men with thorough practical knowledge of Indian [*i.e.*, Anglo-Indian] trade and with the effect of movements of bullion on the commerce of this and that country." There can be no doubt that this complaint represents the feeling of the whole country. As Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji says, in the letter which we print in another column, "there is not a single man in it (the Committee) who has shown at any time, so far as I know, that he has studied or dealt with Indian questions from the standpoint of the poor Indian taxpayer." This fundamental defect we are glad to see emphasised by an Indian economist of Mr. Naoroji's experience. If there is one apparent exception in the person of Sir David Barbour, still, as Mr. Naoroji points out, "he will be judge in his own cause," for he is "the father of the legislation which is now to be enquired into." It is obviously true, Mr.

Naoroji further remarks, that "the Committee simply represents Anglo-Indians, official and non-official, and British capitalistic and commercial and banking interests." And, as we have seen, even such business interests are deeply dissatisfied. On this point Lord George Hamilton's reply is quite inept, but of course he will stand to his guns, undismayed by the grave statement of the memorial that "great and general dissatisfaction exists in the City and elsewhere" on the matter in issue. Perhaps he may feel his back stiffened by the perverse approval of the *Pioneer* and the *Times*.

The memorialists, like some other people, have failed to grasp the exact limits of the terms of reference. But they state that they "feel very strongly that no enquiry will be satisfactory that does not include an examination of the entire monetary policy of the Indian Government initiated in 1893, and a report as to the possibility or advisability of maintaining it." On that head they will poll, we fancy, every independent vote in the country. The object of the proposals of the Government of India was stated by Lord George Hamilton, in his letter to the Chairman of the Committee, to be "to make effective the policy adopted by Her Majesty's Government in 1893." It does need some explanation before one could fully grasp the possible legitimacy of enquiries and conclusions absolutely upsetting that policy. Still Lord George Hamilton says, "I have expressly invited the Committee to submit any modification of these proposals, or any suggestions of their own;" and he adds that "if they should make any alternative recommendation, her Majesty's Government will be perfectly ready to give it their most careful consideration." We are not at all sure that Lord George makes his position any clearer than it was before. The Committee, in any case, have received as the key-note: "make effective the policy of 1893." Is it likely that they will address themselves, notwithstanding, to a frank examination of the situation on the merits? Is it not more than likely that they will deal with every point in the light of the question: "How shall I make effective the policy of 1893?" Depend upon it, this is no free and independent investigation. It is heavily biassed from the start. The only course open to those who regard the whole business with misgiving, if not actually with alarm, is to bring outside influence to bear on the deliberations. But the Government has provided carefully against that possibility. The Committee will not be open to the public. Why not? Why this mystery? It will not do to say that there is fear of premature disclosures which might affect markets. Hints are sure enough to drop out here and there; and, in the doubtfulness of rumours, the speculative mischief may easily be ten times worse than a daily newspaper report. Of course, as Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji points out in his letter, it will be too late for discussion or consideration when the Report comes out in a mass of Blue-book; there will be precious little use in talking "when once the Government has attained its object." What is clearly wanted, on all grounds, is the opportunity of open and immediate public discussion, day by day, as the evidence is unfolded. And who is to be asked to give evidence? Will representatives of the Indian taxpayer have a chance? Perhaps it is useless to worry about the matter. The Government has plainly made up its mind. The mints are not to be opened: that would be "an act of lunacy." The policy of 1893 is to be "made effective"; that is to say, by the establishment of a gold standard *pour rire*. The Committee, if favourable, will be used as an expert backer; if unfavourable it will be thrown over. It is only the strong and firm voice of the country that can withhold the Government from taking the final and fatal plunge, and we should like to think that that voice of sanity will be heard. The defects of the Committee—of its composition, its subject-matter, and its methods—are glaring enough. But when all has been said upon this head, the matter of really vital importance still remains untouched. For, at best, the Committee is to deal only with the merest palliative of an organic and fatal disease. Currency-tinkering, reinforced by limitless borrowing, may for the moment seem to our shallow-pates to serve its turn. But no permanent relief or security can be hoped for until the powers that be open their eyes to the plain facts—that the economic condition of India is without parallel in the world, and that the root evil of it is the incessant and enormous drain of wealth from the country without equivalent return.

ANGLO-INDIAN CONTEMPT AND INDIAN DISAFFECTION.

Among the many difficulties which surround English rule in India, difficulties inherent in all government by aliens, there is one not due to the governed, but to those who hold power—the difficulty of ruling the rulers and of enforcing on the governing race those maxims of toleration, of respect, and of good feeling, which persons in authority over a subject population are so apt to forget. And like so many of the other dangers that threaten the happiness of India—like the poverty of the people and the economic drain involved in the payments to England—this, as is allowed on all hands, constitutes a growing evil and one that has within the last twenty years reached formidable dimensions. In one respect, indeed, the traditions of an earlier time still prevail, and the ancient religions of India are still protected and respected by those who bear sway in her sacred cities. There may have been many inconveniences and perhaps some oppressions in the rule of the East India Company, but this at least may be gratefully remembered by the Indians of a later age that, from whatever motive, the old Company was the firm opponent of all attacks on the ancient religions of the country, and that this policy, without which the English rule would have been either an impossibility or a tyranny of the worst kind, has been handed down as an honourable tradition through generations of English officials in India even to the present day. When we think of how much misery and disturbance has been caused from time to time by an unwitting interference with the sacred customs of the people, some faint idea may be gained of what the result would have been had the Government ever fallen into the hands of religious or moral fanatics, and the Indians may be thankful to those wise rulers who, even if they were moved by no belief in religious freedom, yet at least from a desire for prosperity and good government saved India from so great a calamity.

But though this traditional respect for the religions of India still remains, respect for the people, never too great, has for a long time been steadily declining. Where every motive of policy would have dictated at least an outward show of sympathy and courtesy, there is too often seen an open contempt that is perhaps as galling to the Indian as actual cruelty and oppression. Nor is it difficult to see why this contempt has been growing with the increasing ignorance of Indian feeling on the part of officials, and the increasing number of Indians who have had an education after European models. The English official is more and more a stranger in a strange land. With improved communication he less and less makes India his home. He retains to a greater degree the feelings prevalent in England, and judges India more and more by English standards. He has thus less inclination to study and less opportunity of studying the real life and character of the people, and is therefore more easily impressed by those superficial differences from an accustomed standard which in so many countries give the passing traveller an unfavourable opinion of the inhabitants. Every nation may appear despicable if judged by the opinions of another that has grown up with a different history, and a different environment. It would be scarcely fair to let a Hindu pass judgment on an English butcher, or a Mahometan on an English publican; yet the virtues of a Bengalee are to be weighed and found wanting in accordance with the views of life prevalent in Suffolk or Caithness. From such rash judgments, the earliest English rulers of India, with all their faults, were to some extent preserved by the still imposing remains of Indian power, and their successors by that intimate knowledge of the country which long and unbroken residence in the case of all but the very best men alone can give. But just in proportion as the interests of the present civilians are centred in England, so does the avoidance of such prejudiced judgments become more and more difficult.

All this is obvious enough, but the second reason, the increasing number of educated Indians, savours of a contradiction; for it may at first sight seem unlikely that in proportion as the Indians have made efforts to bridge the gulf between the two races, so has the contempt of the stronger race increased; and yet so it is. And it may at once be admitted that the Indian of a bygone day, wrapped in the mysterious isolation of the East, was more calculated to impress the European in India, than his descendant

striving earnestly to beat the Englishman with weapons to which the Englishman has been long accustomed, striving to bend his mind to that new learning, that science and literature of the West which has grown up in an environment so foreign to all his ideas and prejudices. The most successful imitation is seldom venerable; and if in this case the imitation has sometimes failed, we can scarcely wonder that all the heroism involved in such a struggle with new conditions has been forgotten, and the most trivial aspects of failure alone remembered. How much has been heard of the blunders of Indians in writing English from men who themselves would have been hard pressed to write even as well in French or German. How often has the courage necessary to force a way among the ruling race been envisaged only as unbridled insolence or overweening conceit. The exact mean between servitude and licence cannot be reached at a step. And as the English ideas of liberty have grown in India with the spread of education, so has grown the official distrust of the educated Indian. The respect which was given to ignorant subservience is denied to those who dare to claim their share of the vaunted freedom of the English, and who use the learning so painfully acquired to criticise their conquerors in their conquerors' tongue. The cherished ideas of Englishmen assume a new aspect in an Indian dress, and distrust adds a new and more bitter strain to the contempt of the victors for the vanquished.

And this combination of ignorance and distrust has a result which cannot fail still further to lower the opinion Anglo-Indians have of the Indian character. Some may be able to recall the scathing words in which Burke denounced the Banyans, who, in the early days of English rule, dominated the younger officials; for the younger men with great prospects and small pay often became the debtors of their own servants. The great orator showed the younger representatives of the ruling power as the creatures of the worst elements of Indian society, seeing everything with their eyes and doing everything at their bidding. The days of the Banyans have long passed. A wiser ordering of the gradations of salary has freed the Englishman and the Indian from the corrupt tyranny of the Englishman's servants. But the old evil has reappeared in another form. As the officials become less and less friendly with the educated Indians, so they are more and more thrown for their knowledge of the people they have to govern on the worst classes of time-servers and sycophants. The independent Indian has become too critical, therefore they must have recourse to the police-spy. And having recourse to him, is it wonderful that both from his person and his information they conceive the worst opinion of the Indian character?

Since, then, this increase of contempt is almost inevitable, while all proclaim, at least in words, the need of greater sympathy between the two races, the *Pioneer* has done a useful work by calling attention, in an article on "The Training of Junior Civil Servants," to the evil which results from setting young officials to spend "the greater portion of their time in criminal work." The *Pioneer* continues:—

> The latter is a great evil; for it is hardly possible for a man, introduced to a new country as a police magistrate, to obtain other than a very low idea of the natives of the country. What would be the opinion of a foreigner on the English people, if he were suddenly planted down as a magistrate of an English police-court? Magisterial work brings a man into contact with the very lowest strata of Indian society, and continuous criminal work at the outset of a career is pretty certain to give a distinct bias against Native character.

And it suggests that for his first year and a half—that is, for one hot and two cold seasons—the young official should be set to revenue work, which would at once bring him into closer contact with the ordinary inhabitants of the country, and would be of more use to him in his subsequent career. All this is excellent, and too much praise cannot be given to the *Pioneer* for so continually demanding an increase of sympathy and knowledge between the officials and the people; but it would be more excellent still if the *Pioneer* and the other Anglo-Indian newspapers were closed to all those expressions of contempt which do so much to mar the effect of this most sound advice.

How great this contempt has become may be seen both by the speech and the action of many Anglo-Indians. That it is full of danger is hardly to be denied; nor that a greater show of consideration and respect would do more than anything else to make our rule agreeable to the people. Anglo-Indians have often in surprise contrasted the readiness of the Hindus to submit to the oppressive rule of the Moguls, with the critical attitude they assume towards our beneficent sway. For this difference there are several good reasons. First, immense as was the Mogul taxation, the revenue was spent in the country, and there was not therefore the economic drain from which India is now suffering. Secondly, the conquerors did not mock the conquered by telling them of liberty and self-government in which they were never to share; for a common servitude is much less felt. Thirdly, the highest offices of State were open to and were filled by the Hindu equally with the Mahometan. But more than all, the glowing terms in which the great Emperor Akbar praised the character of his Hindu subjects salved many wounds, and made all look up to him as the true father of his people. The Moguls may have been tyrants, but would that in this every English official in India had the spirit of Akbar.

THE WEEK IN PARLIAMENT.

BY OUR OWN ONLOOKER.

THERE is but one subject to write about this week; one name has been on every lip, and one thought in every heart—Gladstone. I despair of making anyone unacquainted with Westminster really understand the depth of the feeling caused by the death of Mr. Gladstone. For it is here in the home of his fame that his loss has been felt more keenly than anywhere, except, of course, in the stricken household of Hawarden. The whole place seems to be permeated with the memory of his matchless career. Technically, of course, he had ceased to be a member of the House of Commons, but all men of all parties still fondly and proudly claimed him as one of them.

His record was in so many respects unique. He was the only commoner surviving who had sat in the old building that was destroyed by fire. Even the venerable Mr. Villiers, who died a month or two ago aged 96, could claim no such experience. Mr. Gladstone's maiden speech was delivered before the foundation stone of this building had been laid. More than fifty years ago he was a Cabinet Minister. No other man was ever Prime Minister of England four times; no other man sustained the weight of that illustrious office when more than 84 years of age. And he died as he had lived "Mr." Gladstone, his stately simplicity unmarred by a title. Well might the members do him honour, for no man living will look upon his equal.

As I write this I can see the two front benches on which he used to sit, listening, talking, writing letters, always alert, interested, active. There are the two boxes, over one of which he many and many a time spoke as Prime Minister or expounded budgets as Chancellor of the Exchequer. Over the other he has on a hundred occasions thundered as Leader of the Opposition. Both have resounded again and again under his blows, and one is said to be dented by his signet ring. There is the clock to which he pointed with out-stretched arm and dramatic gesture as he claimed that "time is on our side." Indeed, look where you will you are reminded of the man who ruled and dominated the place so long as he was there, whether in office or not, and whose death has caused such a wave of feeling to pass through it as has never been experienced before.

It is a place of artificiality, this House of Commons. Most of the demonstrations, applause, laughter, shouts of indignation, and what not are "put on" for the occasion. But the feeling during the last few days has been real and true; it has hushed the turmoil of parties and united men of all sorts of views and temperaments for once. When the news was flashed to London that Mr. Gladstone was sinking, it was felt instinctively by all men that when the end was announced the House would adjourn out of respect to his memory. No stickler for precedent pointed out, what is nevertheless true, that never in the history of Parliament had the House of Commons adjourned on the death of a commoner who was not a member of the House. It was felt on all hands that there are occasions now and then on which precedents can be made—and this was one. Directly the House met on Thursday, after prayers, which are regarded generally as a mere formality, but which on this occasion were solemn and touching in the extreme, Mr. Balfour rose in a full House, every man in black, and all men removing their hats. The leader of

the House is a man of fine feeling, and his voice trembled as he said in a simple word or two that everyone would recognise that after the news which had reached them that morning there was but one thing to be done—to adjourn at once. Sir William Harcourt in a word seconded the proposal, and within a few minutes the members slowly left, standing in groups in the lobby, walking in couples in the corridors, talking with hushed voices about the man whose form was once so well known there, but whose place will know him no more for ever. The day was dark and gloomy and the rain came down in torrents, beating against the windows as if to add to the melancholy.

On Thursday the House was again crammed to hear the tributes of the leading men to Mr. Gladstone, his career and character. There was a long pause and something like a hitch in the proceedings in the Commons. For on the paper there were more than 100 questions, and Mr. Balfour, thinking that these would be put, delayed his arrival. But all men shrank instinctively from having an hour and more of the trivialities of question and answer on such an occasion. When, therefore, the Speaker called upon the first member to put his enquiry there came an impatient shout from all quarters of "No questions, no questions," and the Speaker immediately bowed to the prevailing wish. Then came another pause, but the members sat quiet. Under other circumstances a House full of members waiting for business to commence would have been a resounding Babel of chatter and laughter—but not so that day.

At last Mr. Balfour, who was by no means well, came in looking dreadfully pale and worn. He sat down for a moment, and then rose to pronounce his eulogy on his famous opponent. I do not propose to attempt any report of his speech or those of others. What struck me chiefly was the tone of sincerity that distinguished them all. They might have been finer in form, no doubt, and might have been declaimed with more care for elocutionary effect perhaps. Their shortcomings in this respect made them more impressive. They were not recitals, there was no hint of the parade of grief in them. Mr. Balfour hesitated and stammered now and then, but you could see at a glance that he meant all he said, and, indeed, felt much more than he attempted to say. "The greatest member of the greatest deliberative assembly that the world has yet known," was his description of Mr. Gladstone.

Sir William Harcourt is known to all those who really know him as a very emotional man. I remember he broke down in his attempt to speak when Mr. Gladstone retired from Parliament. He broke down again on Thursday. He had paid his tribute to Mr. Gladstone as a public man, as a statesman, as a "great gentleman," and parliamentarian. It was when he referred to his infinite charm in private life, to his kindness as a leader, it was indeed when Sir William was attempting to read a touching passage about William Pitt as being applicable to Mr. Gladstone, that he broke down utterly. He tried more than once to go on, and failed. At last he succeeded. There were many eloquent passages in his speech, but his tears and his broken voice were more eloquent than his words. Mr. Dillon paid a fine tribute to Mr. Gladstone as the friend of the oppressed all over the world, and Mr. Thomas added a sentence or two for the people of Wales, whom Mr. Gladstone always loved—and the speeches were over.

On the same day in the Lords there was a scene of much the same sort. Lord Salisbury, the Duke of Devonshire, Lord Kimberley, and Lord Rosebery spoke in praise of the great commoner. Peeresses sat round in their galleries, and the leading men of the Lower House gathered in front of the throne. Here, again, the speeches had the ring of true feeling. But Lord Rosebery's excelled all others in both Houses. It was a speech which will never be forgotten by those who heard it. He had but a day or two before been blessed by the great statesman from his deathbed, and he seemed to have caught the mantle which had dropped from Mr. Gladstone's shoulders. I felt a thrill when I heard him declare that there was never any cause so forlorn and hopeless that Mr. Gladstone would not take it up. He was as dauntless as he was pure. And then the reference to Mrs. Gladstone, that "pathetic and solitary figure," moved everyone who heard it. The peeresses wept openly, and in another part of the speech, when Lord Rosebery declared that the last letter written by Mr. Gladstone had been to Lady Salisbury, when Lord Salisbury had just had a marvellous escape from death in a carriage accident, it was seen that the Prime Minister had his head bowed down and tears were stealing down his face. I feel I have given but a poor account of scenes to which no pen can do justice. But whatever may be said in speeches or in written articles, all men feel that in connexion with this subject not the half of what is in their hearts has been told.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

THE CURRENCY COMMITTEE.

To the Editor of "India."

Sir,—Lord George Hamilton has appointed a Committee. It will be observed that there is not a single man on it who has shown at any time, as far as I know, that he has studied or dealt with Indian questions from the standpoint of the poor Indian taxpayer. The Committee simply represents Anglo-Indians—official and non-official—and British capitalistic, commercial, and banking interests.

The one man, Sir David Barbour, who may be supposed to bring some knowledge from the Indian taxpayer's point of view, will be a judge in his own case. He himself is the father of the legislation which is now to be enquired into.

Next, I do not know whether evidence is to be taken. And who would be the witnesses? The same Anglo-Indian officials and non-officials, and British capitalistic, commercial, and banking interests. If by some chance one knowing or representing the Indian taxpayers' interests gave evidence it would be literally overwhelmed and buried under the large mass of the evidence on the other side.

Again, the Government of India has distinctly put down its foot that the mints must remain closed, and that a gold standard must be introduced, with its general indifference to the Indian taxpayer. Anyone who has carefully studied the tactics of the Governments of India in both countries knows that where once they come to a definite determination, they will carry these foregone conclusions by every possible device and "subterfuge," be the obstacles in their way what they may. I am sorry I do not see that much good can result from this Committee, with due consideration for the wretched taxpayer. I shall be glad indeed if I prove a wrong prophet.

It will also be observed that the Committee will not be open to the public. So that when the report is out, discussion or consideration by the public will be "too late," or at least profitless, when once the Government has attained its object. Open, immediate discussion in public, while the Committee is sitting, is the only chance for any satisfactory result.

Yours, etc.,

Dadabhai Naoroji.

Washington House,
72, Anerley Park, S.E.
May 22, 1898.

HOW TO CIVILISE THE AFRIDIS.

To the Editor of "India."

Sir,—It is to me surprising that Mr. Lionel James (the author of "The Indian Frontier War") should commit the error of advocating the cultivation of the tea-plant in Afridi land, since a glance at a meteorological map of India will show that the whole of the North-West frontier lies within the zone of deficient rainfall, the annual average being nowhere higher than twenty inches. Mr. James's proposal, however, meets with the approval of nearly every English journal in which a review of his book has appeared. I may, therefore, be allowed to state that any country which has only an average rainfall of twenty or even of forty inches is quite unsuited for the economical growth of the tea-plant. Dairying, however, might be introduced in Afridi land to advantage in conjunction with the cultivation of the sugar beet. India imported 2,682,463 cwt. of refined sugar in season 1896-7; and it may be worth considering whether the sugar beet can be successfully grown in the rich soil of the Mastura and Tirah valleys. For years I have cultivated sugar beet and its twin-brother the mangold as field-crops in Behar with the most successful results. Moreover, turnips grow to perfection in the Punjab and in Afghanistan; there is, therefore, no reason why the sugar beet should not prove a valuable crop in the valleys of the North-West frontier.

In many of the rivers there is sufficient water at all seasons of the year to make it possible to utilise cheap electric power in developing the resources of the wild regions where civilisation fades into barbarism. Gypsum is the most valuable mineral that can be worked for the development of Indian agriculture, and fortunately the hills of Kohat and Bannu contain gypsum in abundance, which can be obtained by the simple method of open quarrying; so the Afridi, Orakzai, and Waziri tribesmen would only have to step across the border to obtain constant employment at remunerative wages if the quarrying of gypsum were started on an extensive scale.

The famine charges and loss of revenue in 1896-7 and

1897-8 cost the rayats of India Rx. 14,000,000, to which add Rx. 4,000,000 for the war bill on the North-West frontier, and a total of Rx. 18,000,000 is arrived at—all of which expenditure is to be met by the rayats. How is it possible to avert the bankruptcy of a country in which the masses are paupers, if their money is to be spent in continually fighting the famine spectre and the wild tribes of the North-West frontier? The Afridis and the rayats are highly-skilled cultivators, and although the first-named are born fighting-men, the love of gain is greater with them than the love of fighting—a fact which shows that there should be no difficulty in civilising these wild tribes if they were only taught how to make the most of their field crops. As for the rayats, these poor people are more familiar with the sight of cowries and copper pice than with the sight of the silver rupee; and I know from practical experience that the payment of rent and of canal-water rates in kind is very much more popular with them than making payment in rupees. If this popular system were adopted throughout India the use of gypsum as a manure for leguminous crops would simply revolutionise agriculture in every village in the land. The following statement shows the results obtained in three consecutive seasons at the Cawnpore Experimental Farm from the use of gypsum as a manure for gram (*Cicer arietinum*):—

Treatment.	Season 1893-4.		Season 1894-5.		Season 1895-6.	
	Grain, in lbs. per acre.	Straw, in lbs. per acre.	Grain, in lbs. per acre.	Straw, in lbs. per acre.	Grain, in lbs. per acre.	Straw, in lbs. per acre.
Gypsum, 3 mds. per acre ..	1,730	1,470	324	593	1,512	1,387
Unmanured .	856	935	21	85	726	641

If the above striking results were obtained at Cawnpore (the soil of which has a very large percentage of carbonate of lime), very little stretch of imagination will picture the results which would accrue from the use of gypsum on the laterite soils of Madras and the Malabar coast. I take the following extract from the Consular Report on the Trade of Pondicherry and Karikal for the year 1897:—"Our exporting firms pay dearly for their over-estimated confidence in the cultivation of ground nuts. During the last two years the output has failed completely. All business has been stopped, and the traffic of our port has diminished in a proportion surpassing the most pessimistic predictions." Gypsum is the very manure required to revive this depressed industry—the groundnut being a leguminous crop. In the Bombay Presidency gram is considered the best preparatory crop for cotton; and in every wheat-growing district of India arhar is the best preparatory crop for wheat. For sugar-cane the best preparatory crop is peas. These facts prove the value of leguminous crops to the agriculture of India; and in exchange for the gypsum of the North-West frontier the tribesmen might be supplied with mineral phosphates for their root crops. I believe that a large deposit of mineral phosphates has been discovered in Christmas Island, which could be utilised to advantage as a manure for the exhausted soil of India. In an attempt to avert the bankruptcy of India it is unnecessary to commune with the shades of Cobden and John Stuart Mill.

Yours, etc.,

May 16, 1898. DONALD N. REID.

CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

THURSDAY, May 19.—Mr. Gladstone died, quite peacefully, shortly before 5 o'clock this morning. Although the end had been almost hourly expected for two days past, the announcement that the great statesman had passed away was received with deep sorrow throughout the land, and, indeed, all over the civilised world. This feeling already found innumerable manifestations. One of the earliest messages of condolence addressed to Hawarden was from the Queen, and it was followed by similar expressions of sorrow and sympathy from public men of all parties and public bodies throughout the country, while the tributes paid to Mr. Gladstone's lofty character and great achievements in the foreign Press were equally fitting and appreciative.

According to Havana telegrams received in Madrid, three American warships on Wednesday bombarded the fort Santiago de Cuba, but fired at too long a range to do any damage. The supplies of provisions in Cuba were said to be abundant in spite of the blockade, as vessels with food cargoes were continually arriving. It was announced in Madrid to-night that the Spanish fleet had arrived safely at Santiago de Cuba. Certain difficulties were said to have arisen on Wednesday among the members of the newly-formed Ministry, in consequence of Señor Gamazo's insisting on the express declaration that the new Cabinet should not be held responsible for the acts of its predecessor. This was ultimately conceded. There was still, however, uncertainty as to the acceptance of the portfolio of Foreign Affairs by Señor Leon y Castillo, who had urged that in view of possible European complications he could be of greater service in his present post as Spanish Ambassador in Paris.

FRIDAY, May 20.—The manifestations of sympathy and sorrow at the death of Mr. Gladstone continued in every part of the United Kingdom, and messages and expressions of similar feelings came from all over the world. The Queen's message of condolence, sent to Hawarden from Windsor Castle on Thursday, expressed her deep grief at the sad news, and her deepest sympathy with Mrs. Gladstone and the whole family. Her Majesty afterwards sent a further telegram asking about the health of Mrs. Gladstone. Among others, messages of condolence were received from the Princess of Wales, the Empress Frederick, the Duke of Connaught, Princess Christian, Princess Louise, the Emperor of Russia, the King of the Belgians, the French, Roumanian, Greek, Servian, and Bulgarian Governments, the Australian Premiers, and the Agents-General of the colonies. Sympathetic allusions to the event were made in various foreign and colonial Legislatures; and tributes to the greatness of Mr. Gladstone's services, and the loftiness and purity of his character, continued to fill a large space in the Press of the whole civilised world. It was informally announced that the family of the departed statesman would not feel justified in opposing a national wish, as expressed by Parliament, for his interment in Westminster Abbey.

The Spanish Government received late last night a despatch from Admiral Cervera, announcing his arrival with his squadron at Santiago de Cuba. The news excited elation in Madrid, and the Queen-Regent and the Ministry telegraphed their congratulations to Admiral Cervera. In Havana it appeared to be believed that the American warships had withdrawn from the coast in order to avoid an encounter with the Spanish squadron. In the Senate in Madrid to-day the new Ministers appeared in uniform, and Señor Sagasta made a statement explaining the recent Ministerial crisis, denounced the conduct of the United States, and declared that Spain would carry on the war *à outrance* until an honourable peace could be obtained. The Senate afterwards passed a vote of congratulation to Admiral Cervera on his arrival in Cuba. A Barcelona telegram stated that between 8,000 and 10,000 troops were being embarked there for the Philippines. Impatience with the present situation was being manifested by the "jingo" journals and a portion of the public in New York. Prompt measures were being taken to re-coal Rear-Admiral Sampson's and Commodore Schley's squadrons. The troops were now said to be ready to invade Cuba at a moment's notice, and no further call for volunteers would be made.

The *London Gazette* announced the bestowal of the Victoria Cross on three officers and two privates engaged in the Tirah expedition for acts of gallantry during the operations.

SATURDAY, May 21.—There were contradictory statements to-day with regard to the whereabouts of the Spanish squadron under Admiral Cervera. It was asserted in some quarters, and denied in others, that he had left Santiago de Cuba; but there seemed to be no certain knowledge on the subject. In the meantime, the certain presence of his squadron on the Cuban coast continued to give much uneasiness to the Washington Government and the American public. It was feared that he would be heard of at vulnerable points on the Atlantic coast. Impatience at the delays of the Goverment in carrying out an actual invasion of Cuba, was accompanied by growing doubts as to the efficiency of the Cuban insurgents as allies. A descent on Cuba was still regarded in official quarters in Washington as inexpedient until Admiral Cervera's squadron had in some way been dealt with. Preparations for the despatch of a military expedition to support Rear-Admiral Dewey in the Philippines were going forward. It was again stated that as many regular troops as General Merritt required would be sent. Admiral Camara was to return immediately to Cadiz and resume the command of the Reserve Squadron, which would sail at once with sealed orders.

SUNDAY, May 22.—Pulpit tributes to the memory of Mr. Gladstone were paid to-day in places of worship throughout the country. At Hawarden Church the service was attended by Mrs. Gladstone and most of the members of the family now gathered at Hawarden, and the sermon was preached by Dr. Wickham, Dean of Lincoln, one of Mr. Gladstone's sons-in-law. It was preceded by a statement to the effect that while the family would have preferred that his body should rest in Hawarden Churchyard, they had felt that there were other considerations of a public character to which they felt bound to yield. Among the preachers who to-day made the life, work, and character of the great statesman the chief theme of their sermons, were the Archbishop of Canterbury and Prebendary Wace at St. Paul's Cathedral, Canon Eyton and Canon Wilberforce at Westminster Abbey, Canon Ainger and the Dean of Norwich at the Temple Church, the Bishop of Southwark at Greenwich, Canon Palmer at St. Saviour's, the Rev. Dr. Parker at the City Temple, and the Rev. Mark Guy Pearse at St. James's Hall. Tributes were also paid to him in the sermons preached at several of the Jewish synagogues yesterday. It was reported from Hawarden that the body of Mr. Gladstone would lie in state at Hawarden Church on Wednesday, and would be

removed at night to London, where it would possibly be placed in Westminster Hall. Tributes of respect and regret on the occasion of Mr. Gladstone's death continued to be paid in the colonies and foreign countries.

The Right Hon. Spencer Walpole, who was a prominent member of the Conservative party in the middle decades of the century, and three times held office as Home Secretary under Lord Derby, died this afternoon after a long illness at Ealing. He was in his ninety-second year.

MONDAY, May 23.—A letter was published from Mr. Herbert Gladstone, M.P., accepting the offer of a public funeral for Mr. Gladstone conditionally on its taking place in the present week, and on its being conducted with every simplicity. The official arrangements connected with the funeral were announced. The body was to lie during Thursday and Friday in Westminster Hall, to which the public would be admitted, and the funeral will take place in Westminster Abbey on Saturday. Certain regulations were adopted as to admission to the ceremony, with a view of giving to the assemblage as representative a character as possible. Political organisations would not be represented; there would be no flowers; and only morning dress was to be worn.

No trustworthy news of importance regarding military or naval movements on either side was forthcoming. There were persistent rumours in Washington of French support to Spain, and of the projected cession by Spain of the Philippines to France in order to prevent them from becoming American. The naval authorities in Washington continued to appear puzzled as to Admiral Cervera's movements and designs.

The results of the second ballots in the general election in France were on the whole unfavourable to the Ministerialist groups in the Chamber, whose majority was diminished. M. Lebon, Minister for the Colonies, was one of the rejected.

The second trial of M. Zola took place at Versailles. An objection raised by M. Zola's counsel against the change of venue from Paris to Versailles was over-ruled; but a demand for a stoppage of the trial pending an appeal to the Court of Cassation was complied with, after some angry passages between M. Labori and the Procureur-Général, and the trial was adjourned.

TUESDAY, May 24.—The body of Mr. Gladstone lay in state to-day in his study in Hawarden Castle, and many thousands of persons, both from the locality and from distant places, passed through the room and looked their last upon the dead statesman. The body was to be placed to-morrow in St. Deiniol's Church, Hawarden, and at night to be carried to the railway station and placed in the train which would convey it to London. It was officially announced that the pall-bearers at the funeral in Westminster Abbey would be on one side the Prince of Wales, Lord Salisbury, Mr. Balfour, Lord Rosebery, and Lord Rendel; and on the other side the Duke of York, Lord Kimberley, Sir William Harcourt, the Duke of Rutland, and Mr. Armitstead. The hour of the funeral was fixed at 10.45 a.m.

There was still no trustworthy news regarding the movements of the hostile fleets in Cuban waters. Numerous rumours from different sources of a naval battle were in circulation to-day in the United States, but were officially contradicted by the Navy Department, which hinted that the squadrons were not in a position which made an immediate encounter probable. General Miles denied the truth of statements that an early invasion of Cuba was intended. A reported declaration by Lord Wolseley that it would be a mistake to attempt invasion with volunteers not fully drilled and disciplined was thought likely to have an effect on American opinion. It was announced from Madrid that the Duke of Almadovar del Rio had accepted the portfolio of Foreign Affairs, and that Señor Leon y Castillo would return to his post in Paris.

A rather striking demonstration took place at Tampa (Florida) in honour of the Queen's birthday. The General commanding the district presided at a banquet, and all allusions to Anglo-American alliance were said to be heartily applauded. At noon a national salute was fired and the shipping in the harbour was dressed.

WEDNESDAY, May 25.—The body of Mr. Gladstone, enclosed in the coffin, was removed this morning from Hawarden Castle through the park to the church, where it lay through the day. The church was visited during that time by many thousands of persons. In the evening the coffin, escorted by a long procession of mourners, was conveyed to Broughton Railway Station, and placed in the train in which it arrived in London at an early hour on Thursday morning.

Very positive rumours were circulated in the United States yesterday that Admiral Cervera and his squadron were "bottled up" in the harbour of Santiago de Cuba by Commodore Schley's squadron; but there was as yet no authoritative confirmation of the story, which was doubted by naval officers. The battleship "Oregon" arrived at Jupiter Inlet, Florida, on Tuesday, and sailed again to-day. President M'Kinley issued a call for 75,000 more volunteers to serve for two years. Much disappointment was being expressed by the American Press at the failure of the Cuban insurgents to redeem their promises, and the New York *Tribune* declared that the redemption of the island from Spanish misgovernment must be effected, if at all, by the United States acting entirely on their own account.

THURSDAY, May 26.—The *Daily Chronicle* gave prominence to the following expression of opinion: "The nation is waiting for one lady—the Queen. It has not passed without observation that there has as yet been no expression of her Majesty's sense of Mr. Gladstone's services to the nation and to the Crown, services, in both respects, unparalleled in the history of the British people and the British monarchy. No one expects the Queen at her age to be fully alive to ceremonial detail, and we will, therefore, suppose that the Queen's acknowledgment of the historic benefits which she and her family have received at Mr. Gladstone's hands is only postponed till the day of the funeral. When that acknowledgment is made, we have no doubt that the Queen will have in her mind the terms in which, through the *Court Circular*, she addressed the nation on April 19, 1881, on the day of Lord Beaconsfield's death. 'The Queen received this morning with feelings of the deepest sorrow the sad intelligence of the death of the Earl of Beaconsfield, in whom her Majesty loses a most valuable and devoted friend and the Council of the nation one of its most distinguished statesmen.' We need not say that by the unanimous verdict of people of all shades of opinion, political and social, in this Empire, every word applied by the Queen to Lord Beaconsfield applies with at least equal force to Mr. Gladstone."

THE CASE OF MR. TILAK.

PETITION TO THE QUEEN FOR RELEASE.

We give below the text of a petition which has lately been submitted to her Majesty the Queen:—

IN THE MATTER OF A CRIMINAL CASE.

Imperatrix *v.* Bal Gangadhar Tilak and another tried in the High Court of Judicature, Bombay, India.

To the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty

The Humble Petition of your Majesty's loyal Subjects whose signatures are hereunder written.

Sheweth.

1. That the above named Bal Gangadhar Tilak is by birth a native Hindu, by caste, a Chitpavan Brahmin, the son of a former assistant Deputy Educational Inspector at Thana and Poona in the Presidency of Bombay, India, and 42 years of age.

2. That the said Bal Gangadhar Tilak was educated at the Deccan College, and holds the Diplomas of B.A. and LL.B. of the University of Bombay.

3. That the said Bal Gangadhar Tilak was one of the Founders of the Poona New English School, and one of the Founders and First Life Members of the Deccan Education Society under whose auspices the Fergusson College was established, and formerly held the post of Professor of English, Mathematics, Science and Sanskrit in the said Fergusson College.

4. That the said Bal Gangadhar Tilak is the author of a book entitled, "The Orion; or, Researches into the antiquity of the Vedas," a summary of the facts and arguments adduced therein being subsequently published in the Transactions of the Ninth International Congress of Orientalists.

5. That the said Bal Gangadhar Tilak is a Law Lecturer and Pleader, and has for the last 18 years been Editor and Proprietor of the *Mahratta* newspaper printed in the English language, and the *Kesari* newspaper printed in the Marathi language.

6. That the said Bal Gangadhar Tilak was on the 8th September, 1897, charged before the High Court of Judicature at Bombay with, and subsequently found guilty, in due course of law, of attempting "to excite feelings of disaffection to the Government established by law in British India," and sentenced to eighteen months' rigorous imprisonment.

7. That the said Bal Gangadhar Tilak is now undergoing the said sentence of imprisonment in your Majesty's common jail at Bombay.

8. That the said Bal Gangadhar Tilak is in feeble bodily health, and your Majesty's humble petitioners are apprehensive of the results of the unaccustomed hardship of prison life and the tasks allotted to him under prison discipline.

9. That for the reasons hereinafter particularly set forth your Majesty's humble petitioners beg respectfully to submit that the said Bal Gangadhar Tilak appears to be a fit subject for the exercise of your most gracious Majesty's prerogative of mercy.

(*a*) The said Bal Gangadhar Tilak has in times past enjoyed the confidence of His Excellency the Governor of Bombay, who sanctioned his election to the Legislative Council.

(*b*) The said Bal Gangadhar Tilak attempted to allay the alarms caused to the Native population by the plague regulations of the authorities, and by himself starting a Hindu Plague Hospital, the funds for which he personally collected.

(*c*) The said Bal Gangadhar Tilak has been recognised by the most eminent authorities in Europe and America as a

scholar of high order, and a student deeply interested in the ancient history and antiquities of India.

(*d*) The said Bal Gangadhar Tilak is widely known to and highly respected by his loyal fellow-countrymen, and an act of Royal clemency in his favour would kindle among them feelings of gratitude and loyalty.

10. The said Bal Gangadhar Tilak has now suffered seven months' rigorous imprisonment, and your Majesty's petitioners humbly submit that the majesty of the law has been vindicated.

11. The said Bal Gangadhar Tilak in the course of his trial stated that the articles for which he was condemned were not written with any seditious intention, and your Majesty's humble petitioners believe that he is not personally animated by any other feelings than that of loyalty to your Majesty's person and Government, and that the publication of the articles for which he has been condemned was an error of judgment.

12. The said Bal Gangadhar Tilak is the first offender to be convicted for the offence for which he has been condemned.

Your Majesty's petitioners therefore humbly pray :—

That your most gracious Majesty in your most gracious Majesty's dual capacity as Queen of the Realm and Empress of India, will be pleased to order that the said Bal Gangadhar Tilak may be pardoned and released from your most gracious Majesty's said jail, or that your most gracious Majesty may be pleased to grant such further or other answer as your most gracious Majesty in the exercise of your most gracious Majesty's highest prerogative of mercy may be advised.

And your Majesty's petitioners will ever pray, etc.

The signatories include Professor Max Müller, Sir W. W. Hunter, Sir Richard Garth, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Sir M. M. Bhownaggree, M.P., Mr. Samuel Smith, M.P., and Mr. George Harwood, M.P.

THE COMMITTEE ON CURRENCY.

The Secretary of State for India has sent the following answer to a numerously signed memorial addressed to him by bankers and others on the subject of the Indian Currency Committee :—

India Office, May 16, 1898.

Sir,—I have received a letter, signed by you and by certain other gentlemen of the highest standing in the City of London, and addressed to the First Lord of the Treasury, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and myself, in which you refer to the composition of the committee now sitting to consider the currency proposals of the Government of India, and to the terms of reference which govern their deliberations.

I observe with regret your statement that dissatisfaction is felt on these points, and I cannot but think that such dissatisfaction must be founded on a misapprehension, firstly, as to the objects to be kept in view in forming a committee for such a purpose as this, and, secondly, as to the scope and extent of the terms of reference.

The composition of the committee was most carefully considered. The principle of its formation was not, as you appear to suppose, to secure representatives of all the various interests affected by the Government of India's proposals, inasmuch as the attainment of that object would have been wholly incompatible with the necessity for keeping the size of the committee within convenient limits. What I attempted was to find a small number of competent persons, with varied training and experience, who would be capable of comprehending the force of the arguments and evidence submitted to them, and who were not likely to be hindered, either by commercial interests or by previous public utterances of their own, from forming an unbiassed opinion on the very important questions now under consideration. In this attempt I hoped that I had succeeded. I believe that the committee as constituted is, as a judicial body, fully qualified to deal with these questions, and that the expert knowledge of special branches of commerce, to which your letter refers, will be thoroughly and adequately supplied by the examination of competent witnesses.

I stated a few days ago, in reply to a question in the House of Commons, that the constitution of the committee was already finally settled, and to that decision I must adhere.

As regards the terms of reference, I would call your attention to the fact that, in my letter to the chairman, the committee has been invited to deliberate and report upon the proposals of the Government of India, "and upon any other matter which they may regard as relevant thereto."

The object of the proposals of the Government of India is, as stated in the same letter, "to make effective the policy adopted by her Majesty's Government in 1893." It is, therefore, difficult to believe that the committee could consider themselves debarred from enquiring, if they wish to do so, into the merits of the policy which it is proposed to make effective, on the ground that such an enquiry would be irrelevant to the matter on which they are requested to report.

It is obviously impossible for me to say anything at present with regard to the specific proposals of the Government of India for securing a sound system of currency in that country and a stable exchange with the United Kingdom. But I may point out that I have expressly invited the committee to submit any modifications of those proposals, or any suggestions of their own, and that, if they should make any alternative recommendation, her Majesty's Government will be perfectly ready to give it their most careful consideration. And I will say further that, in the opinion of her Majesty's Government, the interests of India are so bound up with those of this country that no action which would have the effect of inflicting injury, or even serious and lasting disturbance on the London Money Market, is likely to be regarded as beneficial to India.

I will only add that the importance of enlisting the confidence, not only of the City but of the country at large, in the measures which may be adopted, can hardly appear greater to the signatories of your letter than it does to her Majesty's Government.—I am, etc., GEORGE HAMILTON.

Hugh Colin Smith, Esq., Governor of the Bank of England.

The following is the memorial referred to :—

To the Right Honourable Lord George Hamilton, M.P., Secretary of State for India ;

The Right Honourable A. J. Balfour, M.P., First Lord of the Treasury ; and

The Right Honourable Sir M. Hicks Beach, Bart., M.P., Chancellor of the Exchequer.

We, the undersigned bankers, merchants, and traders of the City of London, desire to point out to you that great and general dissatisfaction exists in the City and elsewhere with regard to the composition of the committee to which the financial proposals of the Indian Government are to be referred.

It is felt that in view of the great commercial and financial importance of the matter the committee should have been composed to a larger extent of men with thorough practical knowledge of Indian trade and with the effect of movements of bullion on the commerce of this and that country.

We would add that it is not clear to what extent the terms of reference to the committee are limited, but we feel very strongly that no enquiry will be satisfactory that does not include an examination of the entire monetary policy of the Indian Government initiated in 1893, and a report as to the possibility or advisability of maintaining it.

With regard to the projects of the Indian Government, we wish to point out to you the very great danger to commerce generally which may ensue, should a policy be adopted which may involve the raising of sterling loans here of large and indefinite amount for remittance in gold to India. A grave disturbance to trade would, in our opinion, be the immediate result.

We would also venture to point out that it is of the highest importance to the Government to enlist the confidence of the City and the country when inaugurating a financial policy of this importance, the more so in view of the enormous difficulty there would be in retracing a false step should such be taken.

The following is a list of the signatories to the memorial:—

Hugh C. Smith (Hays Wharf, Southwark); S. S. Gladstone (Ogilvy, Gillanders, and Co., Sun Court, E.C.); N. M. Rothschild and Sons; Aldenham; John Lubbock; Reginald Hanson, M.P., City of London; Alban Gibbs, M.P., City of London; Smith, Payne, and Smiths; Glyn, Mills, Currie and Co.; for Martin's Bank (Limited), L. Hansard, manager; Robarts, Lubbock and Co.; for Alexanders and Co. (Limited), W. C. Alexander, director; for Barclay and Co. (Limited), J. H. Tritton; J. H. Tritton; H. R. Grenfell; Herbert Brooks (Robert Brooks and Co.); W. Middleton Campbell (Hogg, Curtis, Campbell and Co.); Revelstoke (Baring Brothers and Co., Limited); H. Cosmo Bonsor (chairman, South Eastern Railway Company); Evelyn Hubbard (John Hubbard and Co.); C. H. Goschen (Fruhling and Goschen); Charles G. Arbuthnot (Arbuthnot, Latham and Co.); John S. Gilliat (John K. Gilliat and Co.); A. F. Wallace (Wallace Brothers); Matheson and Co.; Albert G. Sandeman (George G. Sandeman, Sons and Co.); Edgar Lubbock (Whitbread and Co.); Robert C. Newman (Newman, Hunt and Co.); for the Hong-Kong and Shanghai Banking Corporation, Ewen Cameron, manager; Algernon Strickland (C. Hoare and Co.); for the Bank of Australasia, London, R. W. Jeans, manager; Coutts and Co.; Ralli Brothers; London and County Banking Company (Limited), Ed. H. Lushington, chairman, J. J. Cater, John Green, W. Howard, William A. Jones, directors; London Joint Stock Bank (Limited), Fras. J. Johnston, W. T. Brand, W. Muller, H. W. Segelke, directors; per pro. the City Bank (Limited), David G. H. Bullock, manager; Chalmers Guthrie and Co.; for Baring Brothers and Co. (Limited), F. H. Baring, director; for the Agra Bank (Limited), F. W. Quanbrough, general manager; for Prescott, Dimsdale, Cave, Tugwell and Co. (Limited), Joseph C. Dimsdale, director.

MR. GLADSTONE AND INDIA.

SPEECH BY MR. ROMESH C. DUTT, C.I.E., AT DERBY.

The annual meeting of the National Reform Union was held at Derby, on May 20, in the Temperance Hall. On account of the death of Mr. Gladstone only formal business was done, and the annual report adopted. The Hon. Philip Stanhope, M.P., who presided, then spoke of the services which Mr. Gladstone had rendered to his country, and the loss sustained through his death. Mr. F. Maddison,

M.P., spoke on behalf of the labour party, and he was followed by Mr. Romesh Dutt, who spoke on behalf of India.

Mr. DUTT, who attended as a delegate appointed by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, said: I feel it a mournful duty to add a few words on this sad occasion, at the death of one whose name is as lovingly cherished in millions of grateful hearts in my own country as in this land where he lived and worked. (Cheers.) For the loss which has been sustained at the death of Mr. Gladstone is not a loss to England alone; it is a loss to the whole British Empire, and a loss to the cause of humanity. (Cheers.) Your country, sir, is rich in illustrious men, whose genius has shed light and lustre in all parts of the world, men whose burning thoughts and burning words have raised a joyous echo in the remotest corners of the earth for freedom and for justice. But I doubt if even in this illustrious land there has lived within this century a man whose heart yearned more truly and nobly for the oppressed and the suffering than Mr. Gladstone, or whose voice pleaded more eloquently for right and for justice. For half a century Mr. Gladstone's name has been identified with the cause of right and justice, and his name has been cherished and sanctified by nations of the earth far beyond the limits of the British Empire. In Italy, in Greece, in Armenia, in Crete, in Bulgaria, in Montenegro, wherever nations have struggled against oppression and wrong, Mr. Gladstone's voice has made itself heard, Mr. Gladstone's influence has made itself felt. (Loud cheers.) Sad recollections and stirring incidents come to ones mind on the present mournful occasion. I had the great good fortune, sir, to be in this country thirty years ago, when the great election of 1868 brought the Liberals to power. And I had the proud privilege of seeing Mr. Gladstone when he sat as Prime Minister in the House of Commons for the first time. You know the noble results of that brilliant administration (1868-74), one of the noblest administrations of this century. The Irish Church was disestablished, the first Irish Land Act was passed, and a system of national and compulsory education was organised for this country. (Cheers.) I was again in this country, sir, in 1886, and was present at those great debates in the House of Commons which followed Mr. Gladstone's introduction of his first Irish Home Rule Bill. Once again, in 1893, I was here, and was a silent and admiring witness to that prolonged and persevering fight by which the venerable statesman succeeded in getting his second Home Rule Bill passed by the House of Commons. Then Mr. Gladstone retired from the scene of his labours to well-earned repose, but he never, to the last day of his life, ceased taking a lively interest in what he considered to be right and just. One private incident I wish to mention, because it illustrates the characteristic sympathy of Mr. Gladstone for the people of India. Last year, when Mr. Gladstone was living in retirement at Hawarden, I had the honour of sending him a copy of a small book on "England and India," in which I had indicated some needed reforms in the methods of Indian administration. The book had little interest for the general reader, but it had great interest for Mr. Gladstone, and I had the proud privilege of receiving a letter from him in his own handwriting, in which he thanked me for the gift, and expressed a hope that my little work would have some effect in awakening Englishmen to their duties towards their Indian fellow-subjects. (Cheers.) But I do not wish to dwell on these personal recollections. I desire rather to refer in a few words to those great services which Mr. Gladstone has rendered to my country and to my countrymen. Not once or twice, but repeatedly, did the great and venerable statesman turn from the turmoil and bustle of British politics to render services to India, which have drawn towards him the hearts of grateful millions. In referring to some of these services, I will carefully avoid all political controversy, which is unsuited to this solemn occasion, and I will remember your injunction, sir, to exclude all discussion of party politics. I will barely mention one or two facts, and let the facts speak for themselves. You have all heard, ladies and gentlemen, of the frontier war into which India drifted during the last year, and which has been happily brought to a close. Twenty years ago India drifted into another such war with Afghanistan, during the administration of Lord Beaconsfield. As you all remember, Lord Beaconsfield's Government fell, and Mr. Gladstone came into power in 1880; he terminated the Afghan war; and with that sense of justice and fairness which was a part of him, he decided that as the Afghan war was more an Imperial than an Indian war, a portion of the cost of the war should be contributed by England. Five millions of English money were contributed from the Imperial exchequer towards the cost of that war. I need hardly remind you that the decision of the present Government with regard to the recent frontier war has been different; the whole cost of this last war has been charged to India. I will cite another instance. Under Lord Beaconsfield's administration the Government of India thought fit to pass an Act to restrict the liberty of the Vernacular Press of India, a liberty which it had enjoyed under the beneficent British rule for half-a-century or more. As I said, Mr. Gladstone came into power in 1880, and the Press-gagging Act was expunged from the Statute Book of India. On this point, too, the decision of the present Government has been different; they have passed two new Acts this year to restrict the liberty of the Press in India. Permit me to cite yet one more instance illustrating the spirit of Mr. Gladstone's legislation for India. Within the same brief period of Mr. Gladstone's second administration, to which I have already referred, and which lasted from 1880 to 1885, a noble and well-beloved Viceroy, the Marquis of Ripon, laid the foundation in India of what is known as local self-government. District boards and local boards were created; members were elected to these boards by the people, and they were entrusted with the management of roads, primary schools, dispensaries, and other local institutions. Taxpayers in towns were allowed to elect their own representatives, and municipalities were allowed to elect their own chairmen. On this point also the spirit of Mr. Gladstone's administration differs from that of the present administration, for a Bill has been introduced this year by the present Government to take away from the Municipality of Calcutta those powers of self-government which it has enjoyed for many years past. Ladies and gentlemen, I need not allude to other instances, nor shall I on this solemn occasion discuss the current politics of India. India has fallen upon evil times, and we are passing through dangers which threaten to overwhelm us and wrest from us those humble rights and privileges which we have enjoyed in the past. We are filled with alarm, but not with despair. Standing—if I may say so—by the grave of the greatest Liberal statesman of this century, we cannot think that Liberal Government is dead even in the dependency of India. The great heart of England is sound to the core—(cheers)—and England, which is just and true to her colonies all over the world, cannot be unjust and untrue to India—at least, as long as England can cherish and love and venerate the name and the memory of Mr. Gladstone. (Prolonged cheers.)

The following is the passage in the annual (1897) report of the Executive Committee of the National Reform Union which refers to India. After referring to England's supposed collision with Russia in the Far East, the report continued:—

No clearer proof of the folly of this Russophobe policy can be found than in India, where for some years past thousands of lives and millions of money have been wasted in the search for a more "scientific" frontier than that which nature has supplied, and for a barrier against a hypothetical invasion by Russia. In spite of the pleas and pretexts of those "Military Mandarins" who have so powerfully influenced the policy of successive Indian Governments in this direction, the best and sanest authorities, both military and civil, have proved that the "forward" policy has been as futile for its professed purpose as it has been disastrous for India. To that policy is mainly due the chronic deficit in the finances of India, and the excessive taxation of its poverty-stricken inhabitants, whose misery has been so terribly increased by the late famine and by the plague which still rages in the western districts. It is not only natural that that misery and the discontent it engenders should occasionally find expression in the organs of Native opinion, but it is better that it should do so rather than that it should smoulder beneath the surface and only find vent in secret and treasonable societies; and the recent action of the Government in gagging the Indian Press, and in prosecuting Native editors, is to be condemned as both foolish and dangerous.

The true interests both of the peoples of that great dependency and of this nation demand that the bugbear of Russian invasion should be banished, and that an amicable understanding should be come to speedily between the Governments of Great Britain and Russia as to their respective spheres of influence and action in the vast continent of Asia.

Imperial Parliament.

Friday, May 20.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS.

East India (Contagious Diseases),—Petitions against State regulation from Leeds (two), Glasgow, and Birkenhead; to lie upon the Table.

East India (Contagious Diseases),—Petitions against State regulation from Leeds, Glasgow (two), and Pontefract; to lie upon the Table.

East India (Penal Code and Criminal Procedure Code Amendment Acts,—copy presented—of papers relating to amendments in the law relating to sedition and defamation [by command]; to lie upon the Table.

East India (Post Office Act, 1898),—copy presented—of papers referring to amendments in the law relating to the Post Office in India [by command]; to lie upon the Table.

Monday, May 23.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS.

East India (Contagious Diseases),—Petitions against State regulation; from Bath, Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Hastings; to lie upon the Table.

STATE REGULATION OF VICE IN INDIA.

Mr. JAMES STUART asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he would lay upon the Table of the House a Copy of the New Cantonment Act and the New Cantonment Rules, the drafts of which were sanctioned by him in his despatch of July 8, 1897 [C. 8538]:

And, whether he would also lay upon the Table any Correspondence which had taken place in reference to the treatment of soldiers in cantonments, in pursuance of the last paragraph in the despatch referred to.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have no objection to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the Act and of the Rules referred to. The correspondence is not yet complete, but when it is I will consider whether it can be laid on the Table.

THE DUTY ON KOHAT SALT.

Mr. HERBERT LEWIS asked the Secretary of State for India whether the duty on Kohat salt was four annas per maund up to 1883; whether in that year it was increased to eight annas per maund; and whether in 1896 the duty was increased to two rupees per maund:

Whether that increase of duty upon one of the prime necessities of life was alleged by the Afridis to be one of the chief grievances which led to the frontier war:

And, whether the Government would take the necessary steps to remedy that grievance.

Lord G. HAMILTON: On February 11 last I stated, in reply to a question, that the Kohat salt duty was raised in 1883 to eight annas, and recently to thirty-two annas per Kohat maund, which is equivalent to twenty-six annas per Indian maund, for the reasons given in the correspondence which had then just been presented. It appears from that correspondence that, in the opinion of the Government of India, the increase in the salt duty was put forward by the Afridis as a pretext, after they had already committed themselves to hostilities. The correspondence also shows that, as I have already twice stated in the House this session, I propose to await a report on the subject which I shall expect to receive when trade shall have been re-established for some little time.

THE BURMO-CHINESE FRONTIER COMMISSION.

Mr. DRAGE asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the southern section of the Commission for delineating the Burmo-Chinese frontier had dispersed:

Whether any work was done by the section:

And, whether he could state what action her Majesty's Government proposed to take in the matter, in view of the constant disturbances among the Kachin tribes on the frontier.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The joint commission for the delimitation of the Burmo-Chinese frontier in accordance with the agreement of 1897 commenced work in December last. Upon arrival at Lwalien in the second section south of the Taping river, a discrepancy between the Chinese and English versions of the agreement led to a difference of opinion between General Liu, the Chinese Commissioner, and Mr. Thirkell White, which involved references to Pekin, and finally resulted in a postponement of the work for another season. Much valuable information was collected by the Commission. The Chinese Government has been informed that the line will provisionally be regarded as that laid down in the British version of the Agreement of 1897, and the map attached to it. Some local opposition on the part of the Kachins was met and overcome, and on March 25 I authorised the Government of India to take any steps considered expedient for the maintenance of their authority within the line of the agreement.

THE SUGGESTED GOLD STANDARD.

Mr. COHEN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the Indian Government had already taken decided steps for the establishment of a gold standard in India:

And, whether the assent of the Secretary of State in Council and of Parliament was necessary for the introduction of a loan in sterling in London for the establishment of such gold standard.

Lord G. HAMILTON: No steps have been taken by the Government of India, since the closing of the Mints in 1893 to the free coinage of silver, in the direction of the establishment of a gold standard.

The assent of the Secretary of State in Council and of Parliament would be necessary, as a prior condition, to the issue of any loan in London, for the purpose of establishing a gold standard in India. It is distinctly understood that any general borrowing powers which the Secretary of State may now possess, or may hereafter obtain, for railway or other cognate purposes, will not be used for this purpose.

THE MADRAS TENANCY BILL.
IS IT TO BE DISCUSSED AT OOTACAMUND?

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been drawn to the notification in the *Madras Government Gazette*, to the effect that the Legislative Council would meet at Ootacamund on May 13:

And, whether it was proposed to proceed with the Madras Tenancy Bill at Ootacamund; and, if so, how the important agricultural interests affected would have an opportunity of representing their case at that distant hill station.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have seen the notification referred to, but it does not mention the Tenancy Bill. That Bill may perhaps be introduced at Ootacamund, but I have no reason to suppose that its provisions will be discussed in Council elsewhere than in Madras.

Tuesday, May 24.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS.

East India (Contagious Diseases).—Petitions against State regulation; from Rathmines, Norwood, and Tottenham; to lie upon the Table.

THE DETENTION OF THE BROTHERS NATU.
SIGNIFICANT DEMONSTRATION.
PETITION FOR UNCONDITIONAL RELEASE.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN, who rose amid Opposition cheers, said: Mr. Speaker, I will not take up the time of the House by asking for this petition to be read at the table, but with your permission will briefly state its contents. The petition is from the wife of Sirdar B. R. Natu—(Opposition cheers)—who has been imprisoned for nine months without trial under the order of the Bombay Government. (Ministerialist cries of "Order, order.") He is not only a Sirdar, but also an honorary magistrate and a municipal Commissioner of Poona. (Ministerialist cries of "Order," and Opposition cheers) All his property, both real and personal, was attached, and though a moderate allowance was fixed for the maintenance of his family, it was not in fact received by them. His family suffered therefore great privations. (Ministerialist cries of "Order, order," and loud cheers and cries of "Go on" from the Opposition benches.) No charges were framed ——

The SPEAKER was understood to say that the hon. member would not be in order in making a speech upon the subject.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN said that he merely desired to state the prayer of the petition, which was for the unconditional release of Sirdar Natu and his brother. (Opposition cheers, and Ministerialist cries of "Order.") The Natus were an ancient family of Poona, and rendered valuable and acknowledged services to the British Government. The Sirdar had always been active in performing his civic duties. No act or word had ever been alleged against him or his brother tending to subvert British rule, and it was repugnant to justice and humanity to keep him imprisoned without trial for an indefinite period. (Ministerialist cries of "Order," and Opposition cheers.) In presenting the petition he might be allowed to add that, although telegrams from Bombay stated that the Natu brothers had been released, the Secretary of State had informed the House that this was not the case, though considerable relaxations had been allowed. ("Order, order.")

The petition was then presented amid cheers from the Opposition.

"UNQUALIFIED" MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS.

Sir WALTER FOSTER asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was aware that at present uneducated and unqualified persons had as much right to practice medicine in India as fully qualified practitioners:

And whether, in view of the danger to which the Indian people were thereby exposed, he would consider the advisability of instituting a system of registration for medical practitioners similar to that which existed in Great Britain and Ireland.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The answer to the first branch of the question is in the affirmative, and that to the second branch in the negative. It would be, in my judgment, impossible in the present condition of India to prevent the people of that country from resorting to Native practitioners, even though they may be regarded by Europeans as not fully educated or qualified for the work they undertake.

THE INDIAN FINANCIAL STATEMENT.
TO BE MADE ON THE INTRODUCTION OF A LOAN BILL.
UNUSUAL PROCEEDINGS.

Sir M. HICKS BEACH, in the course of a statement regarding the course of public business on the reassembling of the House after the Whitsuntide recess, said: My noble friend the Secretary of State for India informs me that it will be necessary to introduce an Indian Loan Bill shortly to provide for the redemption of certain debentures soon falling due, and also the ways and means for carrying on the extension of railway construction in India, and that he proposes to make his financial statement in moving the resolution necessary to set up that Bill. That would be taken on Tuesday, June 7, assuming the other business is disposed of.

Mr. S. SMITH asked the Secretary of State for India whether on June 7 he proposed to deal with the financial proposals of the Indian Government regarding the currency.

Lord G. HAMILTON replied in the negative. The whole subject had been remitted to a committee for consideration, and to take the course suggested by the hon. member would simply be to invite the House to what would be a futile discussion. He proposed, in the course he was going to adopt, to follow the precedent of 1877. In moving the motion setting up the resolution on which the Bill was founded, he would make the usual annual statement, which would give hon. members the opportunity of discussing the finances of the year.

On the motion for the adjournment of the House till Monday, June 6,

Sir W. WEDDERBURN said he hoped they would be favoured with some information as to the form the Indian debate would take. He was glad the debate would come on at an early time. It would, however, be a great loss to the people of India if there was not an opportunity of discussing general questions concerning India with the Speaker in the chair.

Sir M. HICKS BEACH said: The hon. baronet opposite (Sir W. Wedderburn) complains that sufficient opportunity will not be given for the discussion of Indian affairs. He will have two opportunities—first on the statement of the resolution and Bill of my noble friend the Secretary of State for India, and later on he will have an opportunity upon the Indian Budget, so that he has no cause of complaint. (Hear, hear.)

The following notices of motion appear in the order-book of the House of Commons:—

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH (on going into Committee on East India Revenue Accounts)—To move: That, in view of the poverty of India, aggravated by plague, famine, and war, and the unsatisfactory state of its finances, a more economical administration is urgently needed, also a better system of raising the revenue, and some aid for the country in regard to special expenditure on the North-West frontier.

Mr. PICKERSGILL,—East India (Penal Code)—That an humble Address be presented to her Majesty, praying that her Majesty will be pleased to disallow the Indian Penal Code Amendment Act, 1898.

Sir JOSEPH PEASE,—Opium—To call attention to the trade between India and China in opium, and to move a resolution.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS,—East India (Sedition and Control of the Press)—To call attention to the recent alterations in the Indian laws relating to Sedition and the Control of the Press; and to move a Resolution. [*An early day.*]

Mr. PARKER SMITH,—East India (Sedition and Control of the Press)—To call attention to the recent alterations in the Indian Laws relating to Sedition and the Control of the Press; and to move a Resolution. [*An early day.*]

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from MR. ELLIOT STOCK, *Paternoster Row, London, and E.C.; to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

OFFICERS IN INDIA.

PRESIDENT (elected 1897):
HON. C. SANKARAN NAIR.
GENERAL SECRETARY:
A. O. HUME, C.B., ROTHNEY CASTLE, SIMLA; and THE CHALET, UPPER NORWOOD, S.E.
JOINT GENERAL SECRETARY (in India):
D. E. WACHA, 84, HORNBY ROW, BOMBAY.
STANDING COUNSEL:
Bengal, W. C. BONNERJEE;
Bombay, PHEROZSHAH MEHTA;
Madras, RAI BAHADUR ANANDU CHARLU.

BRITISH COMMITTEE.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN, Bart., M.P., *Chairman.*
A. M. BOSE.
W. S. CAINE.
G. B. CLARK, M.P.
A. O. HUME, C.B.
J. SEYMOUR KEAY.
H. S. KHALIL.
W. S. B. MACLAREN.
DADABHAI NAOROJI.
HERBERT J. REYNOLDS, C.S.I.
J. HERBERT ROBERTS, M.P.
C. E. SCHWANN, M.P.
ROBINSON SOUTTAR, M.P.
ALFRED WEBB.
W. MARTIN WOOD.

OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.
TELEGRAPHIC ADDRESS: "INCAS, LONDON."

NAME OF CIRCLE.	JURISDICTION.	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SECRETARY OR SECRETARIES.
1. Calcutta	Presidency, Burdwan and Chittagong Divisions (*except* Murshidabad District) Assam & Orissa	J. Ghosal, Esq., Nolin Behari Sircar, Esq., and Raja Binoy Krishna Deb Bahadur; 11, Clive Street, Calcutta.
2. Dacca	Dacca District	Babu Sarat Chandra Bose, Pleader, Rajar Deory, Dacca.
3. Maimansingh	Maimansingh District	Babu Anath Bandhu Guha, Sec., Maimansingh Association, Maimansingh.
4. Faridpur	Faridpur District	Babu Ambica Churn Mozumdar, Pleader, Faridpur.
5. Barisal	Bakarganj District	Babu Awsini Kumar Dutt, Pleader, Barisal.
6. Rangpur	Rangpur District	Joges Chandra Das Gupta, Pleader, Rangpur.
7. Dinajpur	Dinajpur District	Babu Lalit Chandra Sen, B.A., B.L., Dinajpur.
8. Pabna	Pabna District	Babu Harendra Narain Roy, B.L., Pabna.
9. Bogra	Bogra District	Babu Peary Sunker Das Gupta, L.M.S., Medical Practitioner, Bogra.
10. Jalpaiguri	Jalpaiguri District	Babu Umagati Roy, Jalpaiguri.
11. Rampur-Beauleah	Rajshahyi District	Dr. Chandra Nath Chowdry, Rampur-Beauleah.
12. Berhampur	Murshidabad District	Babu Boikunt Nath Sen, Berhampur, Dist. Murshidabad.
13. Bhagalpur	Bhagalpur Division (*except* Purneah District)	Babus Siva Sankar Sahai and Surya Prosad, Bhagalpur.
14. Purneah	Purneah District	Babu Jogendra Nath Mukerji, Pleader, Purneah.
15. Chutia-Nagpur	Chutia-Nagpur Division	Rai Jodu Nath Mukerji, Pleader, Hazaribagh.
16. Behar	Patna Division (excluding the Muzaffarpur and Gaya Districts)	Babu Banwari Lal, Patna City.
17. Muzaffarpur	Muzaffarpur District	Babu Preo Nath Mukherji, B.L., Vakil, Muzaffarpur.
18. Gaya	Gaya District	Babus Nand Kishore Lal and Upendra Chandra Mittra, Gaya.
19. N.-W. Provinces	North-Western Provinces	Secretary, Standing Committee, Johnstonganj, Allahabad.
Sub-divisions of the	*N. W. P. for the purpose of distributing* "INDIA."	
Name of Sub-division.	Jurisdiction.	
Gorakhpur	Gorakhpur Division	A. Nundy, Esq., Gorakhpur.
Benares	Benares Division (*except* Mirzapore District)	Pandit Channu Lal, Benares City.
Mirzapur	Mirzapur District	Babu Sri Ram, Mirzapur.
Cawnpur	Cawnpur District	Pandit Perthi Nath, Cawnpur.
Bareilly	Bareilly District	The Secretary, Congress Committee, Bareilly.
Moradabad	Moradabad District	N. C. Bose, Esq., Moradabad.
Saharanpur	Saharanpur District	Babu Anand Swarupa, B.A., LL.B., Vakil, Saharanpur.
Meerut	Meerut District	Babu Prahlad Singh, Meerut.
Aligarh	Aligarh District	Hafiz M. Abdur Rahim, Esq., Aligarh.
Agra	Agra Division	Pandit Tulsi Ram Misra, Mursan, Dist. Aligarh.
Allahabad	All places in the N.W.P. not above enumerated	Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Sec. for the N.-W. P. Circle, Allahabad.
20. Oudh	Oudh	Munshi Ganga Prasad Varma, Office of the *Advocate*, Lucknow.
21. Punjab	The Punjab	Lala Jrishi Ram, Secretary, Congress Committee, Lahore; Babu Chetan Anand, Multan; Bhagat Ram, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, Jalandhar City; Lala Murli Dhar, Pleader, Ambala City; Babu Kedar Nath, Pleader, Delhi; and Pandit Perthi Nath, Pleader, Peshawur.
22. Bombay	Bombay Island, Colaba, Thana & Ratnagiri Dists.	D. E. Wacha, Esq., Presidency Association, Bombay.
23. Sind	Sind	Tahilram Khemchand, Esq., Pleader, Karachi; Himatsing G. Advani, Esq., Shikarpur; and Hiranand Khemsing, Esq., Haidarabad.
24. Ahmedabad	Ahmedabad, Kaira and Panch Mahals Districts, Cutch and Kathiawar, Rajkot	Rao Saheb Kesavalal Motilal and Ratanlal Ranchhoddas, B.A., Pleaders, Ahmedabad.
25. Surat	Surat and Broach Districts, with Baroda	Hardevram Nanabhai Haridas, Esq., and Bhagubai Dayabhai, Esq., Surat.
26. Sholapur	Sholapur District	Vishem R. Lele, Esq., Sholapur.
27. Bijapur	Bijapur District	Krishnaji Raghunath Natu, Esq., B.A., LL.B., Bijapur.
28. Dharwar	Dharwar District	Sec., Standing Congress Committee, Dharwar, and Raghunath A. Sule, Esq., Hubli.
29. Satara	Satara District	Raghunath Pandurang Karandikar, Esq., High Court Pleader, Satara.
30. Ahmadnagar	Ahmadnagar District	Shankar Gangadhar Ranade, Mohenlal Hiralal and Kashinath Vinayak Bhawe, Pleaders, Ahmadnagar.
31. Poona	Poona, Nasik, & Khandesh Dist. (*except* Bhusawal)	Laxuman Raghunath Gokhale, Esq., Pleader, Poona.
32. Ichalkaranji	Southern Mahratta Country	Sadashiv Ramchandra Apte, Ichalkaranji, near Kolhapur, S.M. Country.
33. Berar	Berar	R. N. Mudholkar, Esq., and B. H. Karandikar, Esq., Pleaders, High Court, Amraoti.
34. Nagpur	Central Provinces	Kesava Gopal Tamhan, M.A., Morris College, Nagpur.
35. Madras	Madras, Chingleput, N. and S. Arcot, Nellore and Native States	M.r.ry. V. Ryru Nambiar, High Court Vakil, Madras; M.r.ry. S. H. Belgrami, Barrister-at-Law, Madras, Secs., Mahajana Sabha.
36. Madura	Madura and Tinnevelli	M.r.ry. G. Srinivasa Row Garu, Pleader, Madura; M.r.ry. K. R. Gurusami Iyer, District [Court Pleader, Tinnevelli.
37. Tanjore	Tanjore and Trichinopoli	M.r.ry. S. Ramachandra Iyer Aol, High Court Vakil, Tanjore; M.r.ry. K. Vasudeva Iyengar, Mirasidar, Srirangam; M.r.ry. N. Vydianadha Iyer, M.A., Kumbakonum; M.r.ry. P. Rathna Sabapathy Pillai, Pleader, Negapatam.
38. Bellary	Bellary, Anantapur, Cuddapah, and Karnul	M.r.ry. Srinivasa Row Garu, B.A., Pleader, Bellary; M.r.ry. Dhone Subba Row Garu, Pensioned Deputy Tahsildar, Karnul.; Hon. Rai Bahadur C. Jambulinga Mudaliar, B.A., M.L., Cuddapah; M.r.ry. P. Kesava Pillai, Pleader, Gooty.
39. Malabar	Malabar and Kanara	Hon. C. Sankara Nair, Poonamalli Road, Egmore, Madras; M.r.ry. K. C. Manavikraman Raja, Secretary, Kerala Mahajana Sabha, Calicut; M.r.ry. T. Viraraghava Iyer, Palghat; M.r.ry. T. C. Naraina Kurup, High Court Vakil, Tellicheri; Rao Bahadur N. Shiva Row, Pleader, Mangalore.
40. Salem	Salem	Hon. C. Vijiaraghava Chariar, B.A., Pleader, Salem.
41. Coimbatore	Coimbatore and Nilghiris	M.r.ry. C. M. Padmanabha Chariar, B.A., B.L., Coimbatore.
42. Ganjam	Ganjam, Vizagapatam, Godavari, and Kristna	M.r.ry. B. Surianarayana Rao Garu, Vizagapatam; M.r.ry. C. Rungachariar, High Court Vakil, Musulipatam; M.r.ry. D. Subramaniem, Pleader, Coconada.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.—Intending Subscribers to "INDIA" should communicate with the gentleman whose name appears as Secretary to the Congress Committee for the district in which they reside, or with the London Office. All the gentlemen so named are in monthly correspondence with England, and receive a certain number of spare copies of "INDIA" to enable them to obtain new Subscribers, and are authorised to receive subscriptions to the Journal, which are payable in advance. They will also from time to time transmit to London the names of Subscribers who have paid, so that all such Subscribers may receive their copies direct from England every week. Subscribers are requested in giving notice of any alteration in their address, to quote the number on the covering wrapper of their copies of "INDIA."

TO ADVERTISERS.—Intending Advertisers should apply for terms to any of the following: The Manager, "INDIA," 84, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W.; The Secretaries, Calcutta Congress Committee Offices, 11, Clive Street, Calcutta; D. E. WACHA, Esq., Presidency Association, Bombay; The Secretaries, Mahajana Sabha, Madras; SANGAM LAL, Esq., Secretary Congress Committee, Lahore; Secretary, Congress Committee, Johnstonganj, Allahabad.

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

Applications for rates for Advertisements in "INDIA," should be made to

THE MANAGER,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers,
Westminster, S.W.

Advertisements should reach the Office not later than first post on Thursday in order to ensure insertion in the issue of the following day.

In Crown 8vo, cloth, price **7s. 6d.**

THOMAS BEST JERVIS,

LIEUT.-COL. BOMBAY ENGINEERS, H.E.I.C.'s SERVICE, DIRECTOR OF THE TOPOGRAPHICAL AND STATISTICAL WAR DEPARTMENT.

A Biography by his Son, W. P. JERVIS.

"The biographer has done his work with judgment and discretion, and has produced a work of considerable general utility and interest." *Glasgow Herald.*

"A faithful autobiography. As being a centenary tribute by his son, there is much relating to the condition of India in former times, the better enabling us to judge of the progress manifested in that country of late years."—*Western Daily Mercury.*

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS: ITS AIMS AND JUSTIFICATION.

[Being a reprint of certain articles on the subject in the *Statesman and Friend of India.*]

BY ROBERT KNIGHT.

CALCUTTA: Published at the *Statesman* Office.

The above will be sent to any address on receipt of 1d. stamp for postage. Application should be made to the Manager of "INDIA," 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

TOOTH-ACHE

CURED INSTANTLY BY

BUNTER'S NERVINE

Prevents Decay, Saves Extraction. Sleepless Nights Prevented.

Neuralgic Headaches and all Nerve Pains removed by BUNTER'S NERVINE. All Chemists, 1s. 1½d.

"INDIA." Vol. VIII. (1897.)

NOW READY.

BOUND IN CLOTH (post free), **8/6**, *net cash.*

To be obtained at the Offices,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

A limited number of VOLUMES V. (1894), VI. (1895), *and* VII. (1896) *can be obtained at the same price. Remittances should accompany order.*

English Newspapers, Books, Magazines, &c.

WILLIAM DAWSON & SONS, Ltd.,

WHOLESALE AND EXPORT BOOKSELLERS, STATIONERS, AND NEWSVENDORS,

CANNON HOUSE, BREAM'S BUILDINGS, LONDON, ENGLAND.

(*Established* 1809.)

Orders for ENGLISH BOOKS, MAGAZINES, PERIODICALS, NEWSPAPERS, &c., punctually attended to, carefully packed, and despatched by first mails to Australia, Tasmania, New Zealand, India, China, and throughout the world.
Remittance, or reference for payment in London, to accompany all orders. Advertisements and notices of Births, Marriages, and Deaths inserted in all the English Newspapers. Send for a Complete List of English and Foreign Newspapers, Magazines, &c. Also for Catalogue of Works and Text Books in the Oriental Languages.

6d. Weekly.]

THE "HOME NEWS"

Is the BEST SUMMARY of EUROPEAN INTELLIGENCE.

SPECIALLY PREPARED FOR INDIA, CEYLON, CHINA, and AUSTRALASIA.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY.

THE "HOME NEWS" Will keep readers posted up in all Political, Social, Literary, Dramatic, and other movements.

THE "HOME NEWS" Contains Original and Special Matter, and gives the cream of the European Newspapers.

Ask the Local Newsagent to get it, or send Subscription direct to the Publisher.

Subscription, including postage, payable in advance—

Period.	All places abroad.	In United Kingdom.
Three Months	£0 7 7	£0 7 1
Six Months	0 15 9	0 14 1
One Year	1 10 4	1 8 2

CHEQUES AND P.O. ORDERS TO BE MADE TO THE ORDER OF GRINDLAY & Co.

OFFICES: 55, PARLIAMENT STREET, LONDON, S.W.

THE STORY OF THE MALAKAND FIELD FORCE.

An Episode of Frontier War.

BY

WINSTON L. SPENCER CHURCHILL,
Lieutenant, the 4th Queen's Own Hussars.

With Maps, Plans, etc.

Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

LONGMAN, GREEN & CO.,
LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY.

NOW READY.

CONGRESS GREEN-BOOK: No. 1.

THE SKELETON AT THE (JUBILEE) FEAST.

BY SIR W. WEDDERBURN, BART., M.P.

(Being a series of Suggestions towards the prevention of Famine in India. Reprinted from "India.")

Obtainable from the
BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

Price Sixpence, or Six Annas, net.

"Louene"

A Simple, Safe, & Reliable NERVE SEDATIVE.

GUARANTEED PURELY VEGETABLE AND NEITHER OPIATE NOR NARCOTIC IN ITS ACTION.

For NEURALGIA, NERVOUS HEADACHE, FACEACHE, SLEEPLESSNESS, and other Nervous Troubles.

The EARL OF MOUNT-CASHELL writes: "Acted like magic, and relieved pain almost immediately."

The COUNTESS OF BANTRY writes: "A good remedy for sleeplessness."

PRICES, 2/9 and 4/6 per bottle. Post free in the United Kingdom, 3/- and 4/9. Foreign postage extra.

Pamphlet, containing many valuable Medical and other Testimonials, post free on application to

THE LOUENE CO., 43, KING WILLIAM STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.